THE AIMS OF LABOUR

THE AIMS OF LABOUR

BY THE RT. HON.
ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.,
Secretary of the Labour Party

THIRD PRINTING

NEW YORK
B. W. HUEBSCH
MCMXIX

These things shall be! a loftier race
Than ere the world hath known shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls,
And light of knowledge in their eyes.

They shall be gentle, brave, and strong
To spill no drop of blood, but dare
All that may plant man's lordship firm
On earth, and fire, and sea, and air.

Nation with nation, land with land,
Inarmed shall live as comrades free:
In every heart and brain shall throb
The pulse of one fraternity.

New arts shall bloom of loftier mould
And mightier music fill the skies,
And every life shall be a song,
When all the earth is paradise.

JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS.

PREFACE

In presenting this little volume to the public no pretence is made that it is a complete or comprehensive statement of the aims of British Labour, nor is it an attempt to write a book on Labour Politics. The main substance of several of the chapters has already appeared in the form of articles published during the past two months. When it was suggested that I should issue them as a collection of chapters dealing with some of the vital problems now confronting the democratic forces of this country, I agreed to do so; and now I offer them, together with two or three new chapters, to my prospective readers in the hope that they may prove to be of some little help to them in forming their own views on the questions which are discussed herein.

The sole purpose of this publication is to advance the social and political ideals which I have at heart, and I propose to hand over any profits resulting from the sale of the book to the fund which the Labour Party is promoting with a view to erecting a suitable and lasting Memorial to the honour of those

THE AIMS OF LABOUR

THE AIMS OF LABOUR

BY THE RT. HON.
ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.,
Secretary of the Labour Party

THIRD PRINTING

NEW YORK
B. W. HUEBSCH
MCMXIX

These things shall be! a loftier race
  Than ere the world hath known shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls,
  And light of knowledge in their eyes.

They shall be gentle, brave, and strong
  To spill no drop of blood, but dare
All that may plant man's lordship firm
  On earth, and fire, and sea, and air.

Nation with nation, land with land,
  Inarmed shall live as comrades free:
In every heart and brain shall throb
  The pulse of one fraternity.

New arts shall bloom of loftier mould
  And mightier music fill the skies,
And every life shall be a song,
  When all the earth is paradise.

JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS.

shops, in particular, are governed by strict pledges for the restoration of pre-war conditions when the national crisis is over. Nevertheless, the extent and importance of these changes in methods of production, the control of industry, the management and distribution of labour, and the limitations imposed upon the activities of financiers and the enterprises of individual capitalists, practically involve a revolution, the effects of which will remain when the necessity which gave them their sanction has passed away. Most of them are permanent. In four crowded and eventful years we have gathered the fruits of a century of economic evolution. We have entered upon a new world. With the main features of this new world we are still unfamiliar. We cannot yet begin to measure the material effects of the war upon the commercial and industrial system upon which our civilisation has been based.

Still less can we estimate the results of the inner revolution of thought and feeling which has accompanied these material changes. Yet we are beginning dimly to see that the old order of society has dissolved. A new social order is taking shape even in the midst of the stress and peril of the time. This revolution is fundamental, for it touches the springs of action in the great mass of the common people. Greater changes in the material structure

PREFACE

In presenting this little volume to the public no pretence is made that it is a complete or comprehensive statement of the aims of British Labour, nor is it an attempt to write a book on Labour Politics. The main substance of several of the chapters has already appeared in the form of articles published during the past two months. When it was suggested that I should issue them as a collection of chapters dealing with some of the vital problems now confronting the democratic forces of this country, I agreed to do so; and now I offer them, together with two or three new chapters, to my prospective readers in the hope that they may prove to be of some little help to them in forming their own views on the questions which are discussed herein.

The sole purpose of this publication is to advance the social and political ideals which I have at heart, and I propose to hand over any profits resulting from the sale of the book to the fund which the Labour Party is promoting with a view to erecting a suitable and lasting Memorial to the honour of those

who have fallen on the field of battle in furtherance of the ideals and aims which inspire British Democracy and on behalf of which British Labour has sacrificed so much and so freely.

A. H.

December 22nd, 1917.

CONTENTS

THE AIMS OF LABOUR

CHAPTER I

THE POLITICAL LABOUR MOVEMENT

WITH the coming of peace the world will enter upon an era of revolutionary change to which there is no parallel in history. In this country, as in every other, the war has already profoundly modified the economic system of pre-war days, and has introduced far-reaching innovations into industry. Methods of State control which would once have been regarded as intolerable infringements of the rights and liberties of both employers and workmen have been accepted without effective protest even from those bred in the individualist tradition of the last century. Some of these changes are admittedly only temporary and provisional. They were dictated by national necessity, and were introduced upon the explicit understanding that an unprecedented situation had arisen which called for bold and drastic measures. Those measures which relate to trade union practices and customs in the work-

of society have still to come, but they will be dictated not by the exigencies of war but by the new democratic consciousness and the new social conscience which have come to birth in the long agony of the present struggle. The people have been taught by events, better than by any process of rational argument, that they alone make war possible, though they have no hand in fashioning the policies that lead to war: their energy, devotion, and sacrifice, in trench, field and factory, are qualities which their rulers exploit when they quarrel with one another. In times of peace the people feel that they are nothing; when war comes they are found to be everything. War is possible only because the skill and bravery of the common people, their immense industry, their patient endurance, their direct and simple sense of right and wrong, give the world's rulers a feeling of power which they use, not to ensure the happiness and prosperity of the multitudes of humble folk, but to glorify their own names and to feed their insensate ambitions. The people have discovered this, and in learning it they have discovered their own power. Never again, we may be sure, will the people allow themselves to be driven helplessly into war by these sinister forces. Neither will they be able henceforth to see as enemies the people of other countries who are like themselves the

victims of the militarist imperialism and secret diplomacy of their rulers.

Internationalism, as an organised movement, may have temporarily broken down in this war. But the spirit of internationalism, the consciousness of the solidarity of peoples, the democratic vision which overlooks the artificial frontiers which keep the peoples apart, will grow stronger the longer the war continues. In the midst of the universal horror of the battlefield something like an *entente* of the peoples has been established. The democracies of the world begin to understand one another. Some of the old misunderstandings and prejudices, intensified by the bitterness of the present mad struggle, may flourish for some time after the war. Old jealousies die hard, new hatreds have been born, human nature is human nature still. But beneath these unnatural enmities, transcending the passionate antagonisms of the hour, new forces of fraternity and good will are at work, reconciling the sundered peoples and making a covenanted peace possible between them, more durable than the treaty peace that the official diplomacy will presently conclude. In every belligerent country these healing and unifying forces have been released. Nowhere—not even in Russia—are they yet dominant: but the democratic spirit is permeating every country. Democratic

conceptions are influencing the thought of every people, who see the war as the last monstrous product of the economic and social inequalities of the old order of existence which dissolves and passes away like an evil dream of the night.

Equality is the great human formula of the coming era of revolutionary change. We are moving swiftly towards a new order of society in which the idea of equality will govern the political thinking of all the democracies. The freedom and fraternity of which men have dreamed, which we desire to see established in this country and extended to every other, so that there may be no more wars, are rooted in equality. It is not a new conception. It has inspired democratic action since democracy first took shape as an organised movement. It has been the aim of trade unionism from its earliest beginnings, though it may not have been consciously formulated. It is the aspiration of political democracy. The war has quickened it afresh and has invested it with a new significance. Failure to appreciate the fact that the minds of the people have been deeply influenced by equalitarian ideals, to under-estimate the popular resentment of class privileges, whether based on the accident of birth or upon the possession of wealth, which the war has strengthened rather than mitigated, will be fatal in the future to

governments and political parties alike. These are the conceptions which will determine the politics of the future. Where does the Labour Party stand in relation to them and to the vast range of problems, international and national, political, social, and economic, the solution of which will be conditioned by them? Is the Labour movement so organised and equipped as to qualify it to interpret and direct the new consciousness of democracy?

The answer to this question is not difficult. An examination of the present position of the political Labour movement will suffice to show that its form of organisation must be completely changed if it is to be enabled to meet the requirements of the new situation. It is a fact of enormous importance that the development of democratic ideals and purposes synchronises with the introduction of a franchise measure which opens a tremendous vista of political achievement. When the new Act comes into operation it is estimated that the number of voters will be increased by 2,000,000 men and 6,000,000 women —a million of the latter being unmarried women— making a total of sixteen and a quarter million electors. These figures do not represent the actual improvement in the position of political democracy brought about by the Reform Bill, for many registration anomalies and disqualifications are removed,

and thus a considerable increase in the number of electors on the "live" register able to take part in elections may be anticipated. To meet this great change in the character of the electorate and to take full advantage of the re-distribution of political power our present form of organisation is plainly inadequate.

Measured by the extended history of trade union organisations in this country, the political Labour movement is of very recent origin. This year the Trade Union Congress celebrates its jubilee. As a distinct and separate group in Parliament the Labour Party, on the other hand, has not yet attained its majority. It was the activity of the Socialist pioneers in this country which supplied the final impulse to political action on the part of the organised working class movement. It is true that after the passing of the Reform Act of 1868, which enfranchised the workmen in the boroughs, a movement was started to secure the return of trade unionist members to Parliament. In 1874 fourteen candidates went to the poll, but only two were returned, including the Right Hon. Thomas Burt, M.P., the present father of the House. In 1880 the number was increased to three; in 1885 to eleven; in 1892 to fourteen; but in 1895 the number was reduced to twelve. The conjunction of the socialist and the

industrial movements, however; caused the pace to quicken. Alone, the Socialist propagandists seemed to be condemned to political futility. In 1885, for example, the old Social Democratic Federation ran two candidates—one at Kennington and the other at Hampstead: the candidate at Kennington received thirty-two votes, the candidate at Hampstead polled twenty-nine. The foundation of the Independent Labour party in 1893, as a result of the propaganda of the Fabians and the old S.D.F., prepared the ground for the decision of the Trade Union Congress in 1899, when a resolution was adopted directing the Parliamentary Committee to arrange a conference of the trade unions and the socialist societies "to devise ways and means of securing an increased number of Labour members in Parliament." A year later the Labour Representation Committee was formed, and a distinct Labour Group came into existence in Parliament, on independent lines, with its own whips and its own policy.

The form of organisation adopted indicates quite clearly that at that time the creation of a national party was not contemplated. What was then formed was a separate group, not a democratic political party capable of challenging the two historic parties on their own ground. After the special conference of 1899, the Labour Party took shape as

a federation of trade unions, socialist societies, trades councils and local labour parties, and co-operative societies. It was not until 1903 that the Candidates of the Labour Representation Committee obtained any notable success at the polls. Between the General Elections of 1900 and 1906 three remarkable victories were obtained: Mr. (now Sir David) Shackleton was returned unopposed for Clitheroe; Mr. Will Crooks won Woolwich from the Unionist party; and I had the pleasure of beating both the Tory and Liberal candidates at Barnard Castle. In 1906 the party promoted fifty candidatures at the General Election and twenty-nine of them were successful at the polls; in January, 1910, seventy-eight candidates ran under the auspices of the party, and forty were returned; at the last General Election, in December, 1910, fifty-six candidates were nominated, and forty-two returned. In Parliament these members formed a separate and independent group. But they were not a party, in the accepted sense of the word, and some of them had not shaken off their allegiance to the historic parties. In the country, though we maintained our own electoral machinery and our own staff of organisers, the organisation was essentially a federation of local and national societies. When the war came it was made clear that this form of organisation had ele-

ments of weakness which the less serious stresses of peace times had not revealed. As the war wore on, and the democratic will became stronger, we were led to see that if Labour is to take its part in creating the new order of society it must address itself to the task of transforming its political organisation from a federation of societies into a national popular party, rooted in the life of the democracy, and deriving its principles and its policy from the new political consciousness.

CHAPTER II

THE NEW PARTY AND ITS PROGRAMME

WHEN the war ends the Labour Party, like every other, will be confronted with an unprecedented political situation. No comparison can be made between this situation and any that has arisen out of previous wars. The post-Napoleonic period, following the wars in which this country was involved for twenty years, provides the nearest parallel; but in every essential particular Labour stands to-day, both in relation to world-politics and to national affairs, on an altogether different footing from that of a century ago. The Trade Union movement was then strangled by laws which made the combination of workmen, even for purposes of self-protection, illegal. Democracy was rendered abortive by a scandalously restricted franchise which concentrated political power wholly in the hands of the landed aristocracy. Social conditions were atrocious. The people were the prey of the profiteering classes, who waxed rich out of the sufferings and privations of the poor.

A generation of political effort on the part of the people brought an extension of the franchise to the commercial and the middle classes, but added nothing to the power of democracy except the right to combine in Trade Unions for certain limited purposes, and the privilege of "collective bargaining" with the employers. Everywhere the workers were in revolt against the intolerable conditions under which they were compelled to live and labour. Another generation had to pass before the workmen of the boroughs were enfranchised and a beginning could be made with the organisation of political democracy on modern lines. It was said then by an ornament of the aristocratic House of Commons that the privileged classes would have to begin to educate their masters. "Their masters," however, preferred to educate themselves. In the process they also educated the leaders of the class parties, who began reluctantly to move upon the path of social reform which carried them further away decade by decade from the secure privileged position they had once occupied.

In world politics at the same time the democratic movement, which had received an immense impetus from the transitory triumph of revolutionary principles in France, was crushed beneath the weight of

the reactionary "Holy Alliance," formed by the kings for the protection of the monarchical principle and the suppression of every liberal and humanising idea. It is no part of my purpose to describe how the democratic movement shook off this incubus and introduced the epoch of popular government on the continent and at home. It must be enough to say that a backward glance at the history of the nineteenth century will show that the people have been steadily extending the range of their influence in politics and affairs, without any very clear notion of what they were doing or how the final stages in the conquest of political power by the organised democracy were to be surmounted. Democracy had to fight hard for every inch of ground it won. It was in the grip of mighty forces it had not learned how to control. It fought these forces blindly, confounding some that were, if properly used, beneficent, with those that were entirely malignant. It could not see that the mechanical inventions of Watt, Hargreaves, Arkwright, Crompton, Cartwright, which revolutionised the industrial system at the beginning of the last century, were only bad because they were allowed to fall into the hands of the capitalist classes. It is not surprising if, in its empirical approach to politics, democracy made some mis-

takes, misjudged the direction in which events were travelling, and had but a fumbling grasp upon the reins.

All this is of the past. The situation to-day is very different. Democracy is awake, and aware of its own power. It sees things in a better perspective, and realises that at home and abroad the triumph of democratic principles in politics and industry and social life is a matter simply of wise and capable leadership and resolute and united effort on the part of all sections of the organised movement. There never was a bigger opportunity for democracy to achieve its main aims than the one which now offers. It is time that we should begin to think not only of the great social and economic changes that are to take effect in the coming period of reconstruction, but of the methods and means of securing them. The war has proved to democracy that a dictatorship, whether with one head or five, is incompatible with its spirit and its ideals even in war-time. It has also revealed many serious defects in the structure of society. And it has shown the need for drastic change in the composition and organisation of political parties. It is generally acknowledged that the old party system has irretrievably broken down. Evidence of this is afforded by the clamant call for new parties. The appearance upon the horizon of a

National Party and a Women's Party, the probability of separate groups forming in Parliament around the personality of political leaders who have lost or are losing their grip upon the more or less coherent and strongly organised parties of pre-war days, are symptoms of this disintegration. Political power is about to be re-distributed, not only amongst the electors under the Franchise Bill, but amongst the political parties in Parliament which will claim to represent the new democratic consciousness. Minor readjustments designed to adapt orthodox Liberalism or Unionism to the changing psychology of the electorate will not avail. A thorough-going transformation of the machinery of the parliamentary parties and a fundamental revision of their programmes are in my judgment not merely timely but necessary.

The Labour Party, at any rate, has proceeded upon the assumption that reconstruction is inevitable. It has formulated a scheme which is deliberately designed to give the enfranchised millions full opportunity to express their political preferences in the choice of members to represent them in the Reconstruction Parliament which will have to deal with the vast problems arising out of the war. The outline of the new party constitution is now familiar to every attentive reader of the newspapers.

It contemplates the creation of a national democratic party, founded upon the organised working-class movement, and open to every worker who labours by hand or brain. Under this scheme the Labour Party will be transformed, quickly and quietly, from a federation of societies, national and local, into a nation-wide political organisation with branches in every parliamentary constituency, in which members will be enrolled both as workers and as citizens, whether they be men or women, and whether they belong to any trade union or socialist society or are unattached democrats with no acknowledged allegiance to any industrial or political movement. We are casting the net wide because we realise that real political democracy cannot be organised on the basis of class interest. Retaining the support of the affiliated societies, both national and local, from which it derives its weight and its fighting funds, the Labour Party leaves them with their voting power and right of representation in its councils unimpaired; but in order that the party may more faithfully reflect constituency opinion it is also proposed to create in every constituency something more than the existing trades council or local labour party. It is proposed to multiply the local organisations and to open them to individual men and women, both hand-workers and brain-workers, who

.ccept the party constitution and agree with its aims. The individually enrolled members will have, like he national societies, their own representatives in he party's councils, and we confidently believe that ear by year their influence will deepen and extend. The weakness of the old constitution was that it placed the centre of gravity in the national society and not in the constituency organisation: it did not enable the individual voter to get into touch with the party (except in one or two isolated cases, like that of Woolwich or Barnard Castle) except through the trade union, the socialist society, or the co-operative society. The new constitution emphasises the importance of the individual voter. It says to the man and woman who have lost or never had sympathy with the orthodox parties, "You have the opportunity now not merely of voting for Labour representatives in Parliament, but of joining the party and helping to mould its policy and shape its future."

Under the old conditions the appeal of the party was limited. It has seemed to be, though it never actually was, a class party like any other. It was regarded as the party of the manual wage-earners. Its programme was assumed, by those who have not taken the trouble to examine its whole propaganda, to reflect the views of trade unionists not as citizens

with a common interest in good government, but as workers seeking remedies for a series of material grievances touching hours of labour, rates of wages, conditions of employment. This misapprehension rests upon a too narrow definition of the term "Labour." On the lips of the earlier propagandists the word was used to differentiate between those whose toil enriched the community, and those who made no productive effort of any kind but lived idly and luxuriously upon the fruits of the labours of others. It is that differentiation we design to perpetuate in the title of the party. The Labour Party is the party of the producers whose labour of hand and brain provide the necessities of life for all and dignify and elevate human existence. That the producers have been robbed of the major part of the fruits of their industry under the individualist system of capitalist production is a justification for the party's claims. One of the main aims of the party is to secure for every producer his (or her) full share of those fruits—and to ensure the most equitable distribution of the nation's wealth that may be possible, on the basis of the common ownership of land and capital, and the democratic control of all the activities of society.

The practice of empirical politics, the effort to secure this or that specific reform, will not suffice;

Labour lays down its carefully thought-out, comprehensive plan for the reconstruction of society, which will guarantee freedom, security, and equality. We propose, as a first step, a series of national minima to protect the people's standard of life. For the workers of all grades and both sexes we demand and mean to secure proper legislative provision against unemployment, accident, and industrial disease, a reasonable amount of leisure, a minimum rate of wages. We shall insist upon a large and practicable scheme to protect the whole wage-earning class against the danger of unemployment and reduction of wages, with a consequent degradation of the standard of life, when the war ends and the forces are demobilised and the munitions factories cease work. The task of finding employment for disbanded fighting men and discharged munition workers we regard as a national obligation: we shall see to it that work is found for all, that the work is productive and socially useful, and that standard rates of wages shall be paid for this work. In the reorganisation of industry after the war, the Labour Party will claim for the workers an increasing share in the management and control of the factories and workshops. What the workers want is freedom, a definite elevation of their status, the abolition of the system of wage-slavery which destroyed their inde-

pendence and made freedom in any real sense impossible. We believe that the path to the democratic control of industry lies in the common ownership of the means of production: and we shall strenuously resist every proposal to hand back to private capitalists the great industries and services that have come under Government control during the war. This control has been extended to the importation and distribution of many necessary commodities—many of the staple foods of the people and some of the raw materials of industry. More than the great key industries and vital services have come under control; and we do not mean to loosen the popular grip upon them, but on the contrary to strengthen it.

In the field of national finance the Labour Party stands for a system of taxation regulated not by the interests of the possessing and profiteering classes, but by the claims of the professional and housekeeping classes, whose interests are identical with those of the manual workers. We believe that indirect taxation upon commodities should not fall upon any necessity of life, but should be limited to luxuries, especially and principally those which it is socially desirable to extinguish. Direct taxation, we hold, upon large incomes and private fortunes is the method by which the greater part of the necessary revenue should be raised; we advocate the retention

in some appropriate form of the excess profits tax; and we shall oppose every attempt to place upon the shoulders of the producing classes, the professional classes, and the small traders, the main financial burden of the war. We seek to prevent, by methods of common ownership and of taxation, the accumulation of great fortunes in private hands. Instead of senseless individual extravagances we desire to see the wealth of the nation expended for social purposes—for the constant improvement and increase of the nation's enterprises, to make provision for the sick, the aged, and the infirm, to establish a genuine national system of education, to provide the means of public improvements in all directions by which the happiness and health of the people will be ensured. One step in this direction will be taken when the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drink is no longer left to those who find profit in encouraging the utmost possible consumption. The party's policy in this matter asserts the right of the people to deal with the licensing question in accordance with the opinion of localities; we urge that the localities should have conferred upon them full power to prohibit the sale of liquor within their boundaries, or alternatively to decide whether the number of licences should be reduced, upon what conditions they may be held, and whether they shall be under

private or any form of public control. In our relations to other peoples, whether those of our blood and tongue in the British Empire, or those of other races and languages, we repudiate the idea of domination and exploitation, we stand for the steady development of the idea of local self-government and the freedom of nations. On all these points and the problems underlying them, the Labour Party lays down its general principles and policies; * and from time to time Labour's representative assemblies will apply these principles to the problems of immediate and pressing importance, and formulate the programme which the electors will be invited to support. In opposition, and presently as we believe and hope in office, Labour will seek to build up a new order of society, rooted in equality, dedicated to freedom, governed on democratic principles.

* For a detailed statement of the party's reconstruction proposals, see "Labour and the New Social Order" printed as an appendix.

CHAPTER III

SOLIDARITY

THE organised workers have displayed a wonderful spirit of loyalty and remarkable fortitude, courage, and determination throughout the period of the war, but from now onwards the need for practical and effective solidarity will become increasingly evident and insistent. The tremendous sacrifices of the present are a blood-offering for the security of the future, and a grave responsibility will rest upon the representatives of the several nations concerned if, from any unworthy motive, they fail to arrange such a peace settlement as will afford the peoples of the world a reasonable prospect of security, freedom, and progress. If such a peace is not realised it will mean that the most vital object of our participation in the present grievous and devastating conflict has not been attained, and that the military failure of Germany has not proved to be a victory for the Allied cause.

It is imperative that the workers of the world should realise that they are too intimately concerned

in the proper adjustment of all the great war issues to allow them to be settled in any other than a just and honourable way. Moreover, immense problems of political, social, and material reconstruction will present themselves for solution immediately peace is declared. These problems will not be confined to any one nation, but will be international in character, scope, and effect; and, if they are to be solved successfully, joint action and close co-operation between all peoples will be essential.

The defeat of aggressive Militarism and Autocracy will not dispose of all the great difficulties confronting Democracy; it will only mean, in the event of an honourable and lasting peace, that the peoples will be free to concentrate all their energies, their creative and constructive genius, on the consideration and solution of these common difficulties. Democracy has in its hands the necessary power to arrange the future destiny of the world. If the democratic forces are to be successful, it is of essential importance that they shall combine with singleness of aim, firm determination, and complete unity under the banner of Freedom, Peace, and Progress.

There is ample evidence that the workers of this country have not yet formed a just appreciation of the vital importance of all the forces of democracy uniting with one will and a common purpose to se-

ure in the peace settlement and the subsequent national and international reconstruction the essential conditions of "a new heaven and a new earth." It is true they intend that the new Society of Nations shall be built on the solid rocks of justice, honour, and humanity, instead of being rebuilt on the shifting sands of oppression, conquest, and international jealousy. They intend that brute force and all other barriers to "Peace on Earth, Good-will among men" shall be done away with and that the conclusion of this terrible struggle shall inaugurate a new era in which moral force shall hold complete and unquestioned sway. And it must be obvious that anything short of this would mean that the present golden opportunity had been missed and would give a new lease of life to the forces of reaction and militarism throughout the whole world. The only power that can save the present and future generations from a repetition of the present ruthless struggle, is a united world Democracy.

But if full advantage is to be taken of this opportunity to ensure that the destiny of the world shall be at the complete disposal of the people themselves, it will require of Democracy all the best qualities of real statesmanship. It is not sufficient that the nations shall have a clear vision of the new world which they desire to dwell in; they must organise

with unity and strength of purpose and use their power to lay the foundations true and firm and afterwards to complete the whole edifice on right and noble lines.

A real People's International, which shall give concrete and practical expression to the spiritual aspirations, social ideals, and moral passion of humanity, must be founded on an unshakable faith of the nations in the spirit of democracy, and the recognition by all peoples not only of their national rights and privileges but of their international obligations and responsibilities. Freedom at home and domination abroad are incompatible with the ideals of democracy. If the German people are sincere in their professions of faith in democracy and the principles of equality among all nations, large and small, strong and weak, they must begin to establish in their own country a constitutional system of democratic government. It is not a matter that needs to be postponed for consideration after the war. Russia, the latest addition to the League of Democracies, did not neglect to strive for internal freedom during the progress of hostilities, and if the peoples of the world are to be responsible for arranging the terms of a democratic and stable peace the German nation will need to establish popular control over its own national affairs. And until this

is done it will be impossible to build a completely successful and effectual People's International.

In the past Democracy has been far too ready and content to contract-out the vitally important work of national and international construction with the inevitable result that the jerry-built structure erected was too frail to stand when the storm-clouds of war burst over Europe with such terrible effect in 1914. There must be an end of this policy. The peoples must shoulder their own responsibilities, and must see to it that the new world edifice which is to be built on the ruins of the old shall be capable of resisting all international storms that may threaten humanity in the future.

If Democracy is to co-operate effectively and successfully in international affairs, it is altogether essential that the democratic forces shall be united and solid at home. It may safely be said that hitherto too much prominence has been given to differences of opinion regarding tactics and methods, to the incalculable advantage of the reactionary and opposing forces. Surely past experiences must have proved beyond all shadow of doubt the necessity of all sections of the movement inspired by the same high ideals combining to enforce their common will. We cannot afford to fritter away our strength by internal wrangling on issues which, after all, are

not of vital importance and are only secondary to the main aims we have in view.

Whatever may have been the causes of past differences of opinion, and however acute may have been the disagreements regarding the causes of the war and the methods employed to bring it to a successful conclusion, there can be no substantial difference among the various sections of the great democratic army regarding the kind of peace which will make the world safe for democracy, or as to the need for a comprehensive and effective policy of reconstruction. Of this we may be assured, the future will only be democracy's if democracy concentrates all its powers into one channel and seeks to enforce its will by united action. Concentration of its strength can only be achieved by complete unity of purpose and action. What is most urgently required is breadth of vision to focus in broad outline the great aims of democracy, and courage, power, and tenacity to strive to attain those ideals. There is little divergence among the various democratic forces of the country so far as aims and objects are concerned; but if we are to attain a reasonable measure of co-operation, there will have to be a greater disposition on all sides to seek accommodation regarding the methods by which our aims and ideals may be achieved. "United we stand, divided

we fall," is a significant phrase, and the various forces of reaction have long since learnt to give it full recognition and to stand together in face of the common enemy, democracy. Self-preservation has compelled them to work in unison, but only the lack of cohesion and co-operation on the part of the democratic forces has enabled them to stand together so long and to exert so great an influence on the destiny of the people.

But the war has changed men's thoughts and introduced new standards and new values. War, like everything else in life, affects the common people more than it does any other section of the community, and they are determined to have a greater measure of control in the direction of national and international, social, industrial, and political affairs. But determination to control and direct presupposes the definition of the lines along which organised democracy proposes to direct affairs when it has secured control. Organised democracy must have its own definite and well-thought-out plans of constructive reform—local, national, and international; and it must also have its own *"union sacree"* to ensure that the whole of its power shall be organised and directed along those channels which are best calculated to achieve success. Greater difficulties will have to be faced and more serious obstacles overcome

than ever before. For it is easier to criticise the unsatisfactory schemes of others than to produce sound constructive schemes of one's own, and with the greatest measure of unity and the most helpful conditions prevailing, the problems to be solved at the close of this war will demand all that is best in Democracy. The vast problems of reconstruction, which include demobilisation, industrial reorganisation, a world food-shortage, financial recuperation, unemployment probably on a serious scale, and a host of other pressing problems of far-reaching effect, will call for immediate attention. No half-hearted or temporary measures will suffice to dispose of them successfully. They must be tackled in a comprehensive, courageous, and practical manner, and a truly national Labour Party, if it is to prove the best instrument to solve them, must be united in determination, strong in power and influence, clear in vision, and audacious and courageous in its methods of dealing with practical politics. The old statesmanship has failed. If democratic statesmanship is to succeed it must be given a fair chance by its own people. The coming together of the Trades Congress and the Labour Party and the Co-operative movement, and the determination of the latter to enter upon direct political action, is significant of a new spirit of unity. Then the new policy of the

Labour Party is indicative of a bolder effort to impress National, Inter-Dominion, and International life with a new spirit. This is all to the good provided it is accompanied by a clearer conception of personal and collective responsibility and the recognition of the fact that in things essential there must be unity, and in things doubtful liberty. It must more than ever be appreciated that democracy is more than a form of government, it is a spirit. As Mazzini said, it is an attempt at the practical realisation of the prayer "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done as in Heaven so on earth." Moved by a common love unto a common activity in a common cause for a common humanity, we must lift ourselves above the narrow and divisive influences which render futile so much effort. We must welcome the active co-operation of all who stand for justice and seek the largest liberty and the greatest good. The edifice to be erected on the foundation of the will of a free people must be solid and substantial. The democratic forces must begin at once, and, whatever may be their difficulties, continue their task of reconstructing the world in a spirit of unity, co-operation and fraternity, if they would realise an abiding success.

CHAPTER IV

WORLD SECURITY

PRESIDENT WILSON'S famous declaration that the supreme inspiration of the military efforts of the Allies against the Central Powers is the desire to make the world safe for democracy will remain for all time one of the classic utterances of real statesmanship. It crystallises in a brief sentence the spiritual yearnings and idealist sentiments of all free peoples. The war itself has exercised a purifying influence on the souls of men and women, has stirred them to the depths of their being, and quickened and intensified their powers of insight and discrimination. The outlook of the individual has been broadened and his sense of real values has become keener and more accurate. He is no longer satisfied by a general recognition of his right to earn the means of existence; he now demands to be guaranteed the right to live in peace and security. He wishes neither to oppress nor to be oppressed. The war, by the frightful ravages and cruel sacrifices

which it has entailed, has shown him, perhaps more clearly and brutally than anything else could do, how nearly his own life and domestic happiness are linked up with the national life and welfare of his country. He has learned by keen suffering and bitter experience that the immoral and unscrupulous policy of one nation may plunge the whole world into the lowest depths of misery and desolation. He has realised from the example of Germany that a citizen may be called upon personally to expiate the crimes and follies of his Government. And as a direct consequence of this new and fuller comprehension of his liability as a citizen, he has determined to take a more practical and effectual part in the direction and control of national and international affairs.

In the past, British Governments decided when the nation should make war and afterwards determined the terms that should bring about its settlement. To-day, it is the British people who are at war and the people must decide the terms of peace. Despite the prolonged period of hostilities and military disappointments, they remain steadfast in their determination to defeat the ambitious schemes of aggressive German militarism, and they will not relax their efforts until their war aims are capable of achievement. Speaking of our War ideals, Mr.

Asquith said, in his Dublin speech, on September 25th, 1915:—

> Forty-four years ago, at the time of the war of 1870, Mr. Gladstone used these words. He said: "The greatest triumph of our time will be the enthronement of the idea of public right as the governing idea of European politics. . . ." The idea of public right—what does it mean when translated into concrete terms? It means first and foremost the clearing of the ground by the definite repudiation of militarism as the governing factor in the relation of States and of the future moulding of the European world. It means, next, that room must be found and kept for the independent existence and the free development of the smaller nationalities each with a corporate consciousness of its own. Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, the Scandinavian countries, Greece, and the Balkan States,—they must be recognised as having as good a title as their powerful neighbours—more powerful in strength and wealth—to a place in the sun. And it means finally, or it ought to mean, perhaps by a slow and gradual process, the substitution for force, for the clash of competing ambitions, for groupings and alliances and a precarious equipoise, of a real European partnership based on the recognition of equal rights and established and enforced by a common will.

These are the ideals for which the people of this and the other Allied countries are fighting. It is not against the German people as individuals that their wrath and hostility are directed, but against Germany's policy of aggression and oppression. They do not desire to exterminate the German peo-

ple, but they are determined to exterminate the policy of military, political, and economic domination which has been and still is a standing menace to the security and freedom of humanity. The power they are fighting against is the set of false ideals which are "the ruthless master of the German people." It is the ambition to world domination, the worship of militarism, and the belief in brute force as a proper instrument of policy. But security will not be obtained by this soulless policy merely changing its nationality from German to British or French or that of any other of the Allies. The idol of rampant and aggressive militarism must be shattered beyond repair, and the faith of all nations in its power and efficacy must be utterly destroyed. Such a policy by whatever nation it might be pursued would inevitably lead to a similar world catastrophe. The British soldiers and the British people are not fighting for British domination or French domination or domination by any of the Allies. The idea of world domination was not "made in Germany"; it is as old as world-history itself. Germany is merely the latest nation to be deluded by these impossible dreams, which in the past have ended in defeat, ruin, and disillusionment. The end will be in no wise different for Germany.

It should be quite apparent, therefore, that world

security cannot be guaranteed simply by the defeat of Germany's ambitious schemes, but only by the kind of peace settlement which is made after she has been completely frustrated. Peace terms must be based upon principles and justice, and not governed by expediency or selfish national ambition. It must secure restitution of forcibly annexed territory, reparation for all the wanton destruction and wrongs consequent upon Germany's military aggression, full recognition of the rights of all peoples, and guarantees for the security of world peace.

The people have made war in defence of high ideals; they must see to it that when peace comes it shall be governed by wise principles. As President Wilson has courageously declared:—

> The treaties and agreements which bring the war to an end must embody terms that will create a peace that is worth guaranteeing and preserving, a peace that will win the approval of mankind, not merely a peace that will serve the several interests and immediate aims of the nations engaged.

The first step towards making the world safe for all peoples is the establishment of a stable peace founded on the inalienable rights of mankind; a peace which will assuage all legitimate grievances and causes of friction between one nation and another; a peace that will offer a real prospect of the nations living together in amity and concord.

The question which then presents itself for answer is: When such a peace shall have been agreed upon, by what means can its permanency be guaranteed? This is a matter of primary importance, for the hopes of all peoples are centred on security for the future. They are more anxious about this than about anything else: that when this war is terminated the world shall be maintained in peace and tranquillity. This is no new problem which confronts statesmanship. First alliances, then groupings, and finally the system of balance of power, all had for their object security. And each in turn failed lamentably. But if there is not to be a return to the dangerous, sensitive, and ever fluctuating balance of power what alternative has statesmanship to offer in its place? One thing is certain, namely, that the people will not easily tolerate a return to the precarious conditions of pre-war days. They recognise that the old methods have all ended in disaster and they will readily turn to any practical solution of the problem which may be propounded if for no other reason than that if the worst comes to the worst, it could hardly plunge the world into greater agony and distress than the previous attempts to secure international peace.

At the present moment there is only one proposition which can be regarded as practical and concrete

and which contains the essence of real statesmanship, and that is the proposal to form a League of Nations to guarantee the peace and security of the world. It is a reasoned, intelligent, and scientific attempt to construct international machinery to administer justice between nations with a view to disposing of all points of friction which may arise. In reality it will be an International Court of Justice to which all disputes between adhering nations which cannot be settled by diplomatic means must be referred to arbitration. Such disputes may be either justiciable, *i.e.*, disputes which are capable of being decided by recognised international law; or non-justiciable disputes, *i.e.*, disputes which cannot be covered by international jurisprudence but which can be settled by moral law, provided the nations concerned are disposed to accept moral law as being on at least as high a plane as law made by man.

But even this method of maintaining world peace may not be fully satisfactory and successful unless it has the full sanction of the peoples behind it. The spirit of the nation partners must be behind such a League and their moral support must be supplemented by a joint organised power—military, economic, and commercial—capable of enforcing the decisions of the League on any recalcitrant mem-

and of defending any member which may be
cked by a non-adhering nation that may refuse
:fer the dispute between them for settlement by
fic means.

CHAPTER V

A PEOPLE'S PEACE

THE war has clearly demonstrated the extraordinary power invested in free peoples. Take the case of the United States. For several months President Wilson had recognised that his country must eventually intervene in the war on the side of the Allies and in defence of the great principles of freedom and liberty, but it was not until the American people were convinced beyond all doubt of the righteousness of this course that he was empowered to organise his country for war. In Britain the publication of Lord Lansdowne's letter was almost sensational in its effects, inasmuch as it compelled statesmen to recognise that the question of peace terms so vitally concerned the people that its consideration could not be postponed until the close of hostilities but demanded immediate discussion and definition. Hitherto the nation has been more or less content to remain in ignorance of the details of our peace terms: they have been satisfied with general references which were mainly confined to the statement

of broad principles. Now they are aware that while there may be universal agreement on general principles, the method of the application of those principles may differ very materially according to the interpretation of each nation, and it is only by a comparison of the explicit and concrete peace terms of each of the belligerent groups that the world can judge what now constitutes the obstacles to a real and lasting peace. The people have their own ideas of peace, and they are only concerned with the difficulties to be surmounted before that peace can be obtained; they do not care what obstacles prevent the attainment of a Government's peace unless that peace is in strict harmony with their own ideals. They have no sympathy with selfish national interests or ambitions; they are shouldering the oppressive and painful burdens of the war with courage, fortitude, and determination, not merely to overthrow German tyranny and her scheme for world domination, but more especially in order to secure such international re-arrangement as will permit all the peoples of the world to live together under conditions of freedom, equality, and security. They realise that there can be no national safety without international security, that the national development and happiness of a people are indissolubly linked up with international tranquillity and good-

will. They appreciate more than ever that nationalism is not the final stage of a nation's development, but that it is only an intermediate step to complete world internationalism. The effects of the war have been felt by the whole world; there have been no national barriers to the pain, suffering and sacrifices of the great Armageddon. The whole of humanity has been crucified. And humanity, bleeding and torn, cries out for a radical and complete solution of all the factors which contributed to the present world-catastrophe.

Such a solution can only be found in a peace which will remove all old grievances, prevent the imposition of new injustices, establish a world recognition and practice of the principle of the right of self-determination and of free development of all peoples, great and small. It must offer guarantees for the security of world peace in the future. Security is the greatest of all questions for humanity, but whatever provisions may be made with a view to establishing means for the maintenance of world peace, they will surely prove to be useless unless the other outstanding political, territorial, economic, and commercial problems are settled on just, honourable, and democratic lines.

So far as the British people are concerned they have no thoughts of territorial conquests; they do

not seek forcibly to annex any portion of the national possessions of any of the Central Powers or their Allies. They demand neither conquests nor war indemnities. But there will have to be certain restorations and reconstitutions. Such necessary changes will be covered by the application of the principle of the right of self-determination of all peoples. Belgium must be restored to complete independence and compensated for the foul wrongs to which she has been subjected as a result of the German invasion of her territory. The questions of Serbia, Poland, Alsace-Lorraine, Luxembourg, Palestine, and the extension of Italy and Roumania to their natural boundaries, are all capable of being settled on this basis. Territories in Asia which have been freed from the oppressive rule of the Turks or the Germans ought not to be returned to their old rulers, nor can they be appropriated by any of the Allied Powers, in view of the very definite declaration that they are not fighting for "annexations." If these peoples are not capable of exercising their right of self-determination, the administration of their territories should be placed in the hands of an international commission acting under the direction and control of the proposed League of Nations.

The inhuman methods of the German towards

subject races preclude or ought to preclude the return of the African colonies recently liberated from their control. Though the natives may not yet be in a position to exercise judiciously their right of self-determination, they have given very definite expression to their fears of the re-establishment of German rule. They may not know what sort of Government they want, but they certainly do know the kind of rule they do not want, and that is German rule. They must therefore be freed from German domination, and in order to conform with the Allies' declaration of "no annexations" there can be no question of the Allied countries appropriating them. The colonies of Tropical Africa, by whatever nation they are at present controlled, should be constituted an independent African State, the administration of which should be placed in the hands of an International Commission acting under the direction and control of the proposed League of Nations. Any other territorial re-adjustments desired for strategic or other purposes are matters for negotiation at a Peace Conference and do not constitute questions affecting the continuation of hostilities.

The world must be completely and finally rid of aggressive militarism, the old costly and oppressive burden of armaments must be thrown off. This can best be attained by a common agreement between all

the nations of the world having for its object the strict limitations of war machinery—human and material. If there is a return to the old competitive system of armaments it will lead to the inevitable issue—a world war even more terrible and destructive than the present war.

There can be no question of economic domination after the war by either group of belligerents. Economic aggression, like military aggression, is a menace to the peace of the world, and its effects inevitably fall most hardly upon the working classes. Free intercourse, international co-operation, and the removal of tariff barriers except for revenue purposes, should be the basis of international economic relations after the war.

If we get a peace which removes all the old menaces to war, and settles the immediate problems arising from the present war, it will be necessary to establish machinery to guarantee the permanence of peace. More than for anything else the people yearn for security. This may be obtained by the setting up of a supernational body composed of all the nations of the world: a League of Nations with judicial powers to consider and dispose of all differences and disputes between two or more nations. This proposal means in effect the practice of arbitration in the domain of international affairs. Its

success in practice would depend on the peoples who were members of the League; if they are genuine in their desire for world security, if they adhere to the League in the right spirit and continue firm in their determination to prevent future wars, the League of Nations will prove to be a real and effective guarantee of world peace and security.

CHAPTER VI

NO ECONOMIC BOYCOTT

THE speeches and declarations of our leading statesmen, delivered in the early months of the war, offer ample evidence of the fact that this country became an active participant in the gigantic world-struggle from only the highest and best motives. Speaking in the House of Commons as Prime Minister within a week of the declaration of war, Mr. Asquith said:—

> If I am asked what we are fighting for, I reply in two sentences. In the first place to fulfil a solemn international obligation. . . . Secondly, we are fighting to vindicate the principle that small nationalities are not to be crushed in defiance of international good faith. I do not believe any nation ever entered into a great controversy with a clearer conscience and stronger conviction that it is fighting, not for aggression, not for the maintenance even of its own selfish interests, but that it is fighting in defence of principles the maintenance of which is vital to the civilisation of the world.

Such, then, in broad outline, were the principal objects for which the British people unsheathed the sword. We assumed the *rôle* of champion of the

sanctity of international treaties and of the rights of small nations, and sought to impress upon the world that we desired neither territorial expansion, nor artificial economic advantage. This high conception of national duty inspired the entire population of the British Empire and its Dependencies, and produced an unparalleled display of unity and determination. Our armed intervention, taken with the full approval of practically the whole nation, was to be a clear and emphatic demonstration of our stern and uncompromising hostility to the savage recourse to the use of force, and the wicked and indefensible violation of the integrity of a neighbouring state by the German Government, which confessed that it regarded its treaties as "scraps of paper," and excused its act of wilful aggression by the plea that "necessity knows no law." And to-day, after more than three years of military effort, unprecedented in its toll of sacrifice—human, material, and financial—the majority of the people of these isles remain loyal to the high ideals and principles which animated them at the outbreak of hostilities, and are as firmly determined as ever to prosecute the war until these fundamental objects have been attained by military, diplomatic, and political means.

British Labour is convinced, as it has been from

the beginning, that a victory for German Imperialism would be the defeat and the destruction of democracy and liberty in Europe. In the peace settlement, practical provision must be made against any future recurrence of the present terrible world-calamity by the elimination of aggressive militarism from the entire world and, what is equally important, by the removal of all the old-standing menaces and the prevention of new provocations to war.

The Allied nations are fighting against Germany's ambitions and immoral "will to power," which means German domination—military, political, and economic—at the expense of the rights of other peoples. The world will not tolerate German domination, but it does not wish for British or French or Allied domination. What it seeks is a full and practical recognition of the principles of freedom and equality among all nations.

If the suggested Federation of Nations is to have any prospect of real and permanent success, and if the present struggle is to be looked back upon as the war which ended all war, everything must be done to prevent the division of Europe into two separate and hostile economic camps after the war. It may safely be said that the latter eventuality would be fatal to all our hopes of a permanent peace, and a great

betrayal of a righteous and noble cause. Instead of securing the abolition of war, it would perpetuate international suspicion, jealousy, and greed, the evil products of economic antagonisms which contributed so largely to the general causes of the present European conflict, and would lead inevitably to a bitter and devastating repetition of all the losses, sorrow, suffering and sacrifice within a few short years.

It cannot be too clearly understood that this is not the policy of organised Labour in this country, nor of the Socialists of France, Russia, Belgium or Italy, all of whom have declared emphatically that they do not seek the political and economic destruction of Germany. These representatives of the working classes and those in close association with them know full well that all attempts at economic aggression, whether by protective tariffs or capitalistic trusts or monopolies, lead inevitably to the exploitation of the working classes. They cannot regard with any other feeling than one of deep hostility any proposal or policy which seeks utterly to destroy the economic position of any people after the war; and if this is to be the intention or possible effect of the Paris Conference Resolutions, then it would be well to understand at once that organised Labour in this country is determined not to allow the

normal economic relations of nations to be founded on a policy of oppression and ostracism, producing, as it must, hostility and hatred after the war.

British Labour is out to strangle and stamp under foot Kaiserism and Militarism and the "will to world domination"—and to substitute for them goodwill and fraternity: it is not at war with the peoples of Germany and Austria, except in so far as they support the war policy of their autocratic rulers. That it appreciates the danger of an economic struggle was clearly indicated in a decision reached at the recent Trade Union Congress by 2,339,000 votes to 278,000, or a majority of more than eight to one. The resolution was as follows:—

> That the economic conditions created by the War have in no way altered the fundamental truth that Free Trade between the Nations is the broadest and surest foundation for world-prosperity and international peace in the future, and that any departure from the principle of Free Trade would be detrimental to the prosperity of the Nation as a whole.

This overwhelming majority shows very clearly that British Industrial Democracy, as represented by Congress, will decline to subscribe to a policy prejudicial to the economic interests of our own working folk, and one that is calculated to prevent the definite and essential reconciliation of free democracies. Therefore, the proposal to cripple Germany

financially and to render her impotent commercially by a ruthless trade war, may be expected to receive the determined opposition of the British Labour and Socialist Movement. Once the British people as a whole realise the true inwardness of such a policy, how far it is out of accord with their own cherished aims in this war as declared by Mr. Asquith in his Guildhall, Dublin, and Cardiff speeches, and opposed to the spirit of international co-operation and goodwill, they will reject it as one inspired by a spirit of revenge, and consequently a fatal impediment to the attainment and maintenance of world peace.

In the interests of world peace, therefore, the Paris Resolutions, so far as they are intended to form the basis of a policy of organised systematic commercial and economic boycotting, which aims at the destruction of German commerce, must be strenuously opposed. They would provide a new standing menace to a healthy internationalism and to the future peace of the world, and impose further burdens upon the consumers in the respective countries.

If we have amongst us a class of politicians who regard the German people as rightful spoils to be economically exploited and oppressed after the conclusion of hostilities, let them cease talking of a fight to a finish, for no mere military victory can

ever be the final stage of the struggle; it would only mean a transfer of the venue, with a change of weapons from the military to the economic. But British Labour, and especially the organised section, will refuse to regard the German and Austrian people in that light.

The fundamental purpose of British Labour in continuing its support of the war is the hope that it may influence the development of world democracy. In order that this may be accomplished, it is determined that the peace terms shall be just and honourable, and such as shall erect no barriers that will prevent the realisation of these high ideals. A spirit of revenge, if introduced, would vitiate the findings of any peace conference and make a democratic peace an impossibility. Moreover, British Labour appreciates the difficulty that has arisen already by the promulgation of the suggested policy of commercial repression and its effect in prolonging the war. France, Russia, and America all provide evidence that the objects and aims of England are suspected; consequently, we have persistent demands for a restatement of our position. We say to the German people that if they want peace they must make themselves masters in their own house, that they must destroy the Kaiser's power for evil and that they must come into line with the free

democracies of the world; but we increase their already serious difficulties by intimating that when they have succeeded they are not to be a free people but are to be commercially and economically isolated. What is to be thought of a statesmanship which invites the German people to form part of a Federation of Nations for the maintenance of a world peace, and at the same time proclaims the intention of constructing a Federation of Allies for no other object than the setting up of a commercial boycott of Germany? Such a proposal, under all the terrible experiences of the war, may appeal to a section of the people influenced by the wounded feelings of to-day without regard to the consequences of the morrow; but when the full effects are realised they will be recognised as not only dangerous but criminal, and the sooner they are officially repudiated the better it will be for the Allied Cause.

These contradictory After-War Proposals, and the suspicion and doubt as to where Britain now stands, only render it more imperative that our aims and objects should be clearly restated in order that the world may know why it is we continue to fight. General Smuts has stated that the war is already won, and all that is required is for the Allies to sit tight until Germany acknowledges her defeat. If that is so, how important it is that we

should be satisfied that the struggle is continued only because of failure to obtain the ideal peace settlement, and not because of misunderstandings as to our terms. It should not be difficult to give to the country the assurance that we continue to remain loyal to the position as expressed by Mr. Asquith in 1914, and that we are fighting neither for conquest nor economic boycott.

We do not lose sight of that aspect of the economic question as it affects our overseas Dominions and Dependencies, for we consider that without repression and revenge it would be possible to make such arrangements as would improve the relationship between them and the Mother Country, both with regard to food supplies, raw materials and essential industries, without a revolution in our fiscal system. On this point, Sir Robert Borden, speaking as Prime Minister of Canada, has said that the people of Canada would not desire the people of the United Kingdom to change their fiscal policy for the purpose alone of giving a preference to the producers of Canada, especially if the proposed fiscal changes would involve any injustice or be regarded as oppressive by any considerable portion of the people of the United Kingdom. After calling attention to the Imperial Preference Resolution approved by the Imperial War Cabinet, which runs:—

The time has arrived when all possible encouragement should be given to the development of Imperial resources, and especially to the making the Empire independent of other countries in respect of food supplies, raw materials and essential industries. With these objects in view this Conference expresses itself in favour of:—

1. The principle that each part of the Empire, having due regard to the interests of our Allies, shall give specially favourable treatment and facilities to the produce and manufacture of other parts of the Empire.

2. Arrangements by which intending emigrants from the United Kingdom may be induced to settle in countries under the British flag.

the Canadian Premier continued:—

I should say at once that this resolution does not necessarily propose, or even look to, any change in the fiscal arrangements of the United Kingdom. It does not involve taxation of food; it does not involve the taxation of anything. As far as the fiscal system of the United Kingdom is concerned, I followed when in England precisely the same course that I have carried out in this Parliament, and in this country —I decline to interfere in matters which are the subject of domestic control and concern in the United Kingdom. I decline to invite them to change their fiscal policy. These matters are within their control, as our fiscal policy is within ours. And I would go further, and say that the people of Canada would not desire the people of the United Kingdom to change their fiscal policy for the purpose alone of giving a preference to the producers of this country, especially if the proposed fiscal changes should involve any injustice, or should be regarded as oppressive by a considerable portion of the people of the United Kingdom. But what this proposal looks to, as I understand it, is this—that we can within the Empire

get better and cheaper facilities of communication than we have enjoyed up to the present time. That I believe, is the line along which the change indicated will proceed. The question of transportation has been a very live one, a very important one to the producers of this country, especially those of the western provinces. We know that before the commencement of war the cost of transportation across the Atlantic increased twofold or threefold. There was sometimes a dearth of ships. I hope and believe that there will be concerted action and co-operation between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Governments of the Overseas Dominions, by which speedier, better and more economical transportation will be provided between the Mother Country and the Overseas Dominions and between the Overseas Dominions themselves. So that, in this light, I am confident that the resolution passed by the Conference will receive favourable consideration by the people of this country.

Here, then, we have a clear recognition of the position of the United Kingdom and the possibility of some arrangement being made which would be acceptable to Canada and other Dominions without carrying with it any risk of injury to our own people. British Labour desires to maintain the policy of the Open Door because this policy is more beneficial to the workers than a policy of commercial restriction and isolation. Moreover, it believes that it would afford immense possibilities in the way of Government action and organisation having for their object the safeguarding of British industry and commerce, and the highest development of the resources

of every part of the Empire, which could be secured without imposing new and heavy burdens on the working classes. Instead of commercial antagonism and repression it desires a full recognition of the need for concerted international arrangements, having for their object a general improvement of working conditions of labour, wages, etc., by means of international factory legislation to operate in every country, whereby a greater measure of social and economic contentment may be secured for the workers of all nations, and safeguards imposed against their being economically exploited or oppressed. The future must be an improvement on the present and the past, but no improvement can be obtained from an economic war, because this double-edged weapon inflicts fatal wounds on all peoples. Of this Labour is convinced, that a world peace which is broadly based on the expressed will of free democracies cannot be assisted by a temporary or perpetual economic war. And a peace which does not properly recognise the natural economic rights of all peoples will be neither democratic nor lasting.

CHAPTER VII

REVOLUTION OR COMPROMISE?

VOLUTION is a word of evil omen. It calls up a ion of barricades in the streets and blood in the tters. No responsible person, however deter- ned he or she may be to effect a complete trans- mation of society, can contemplate such a possi- ity without horror. It is impossible to say what : future holds, but many of us believe that man- ıd is so weary of violence and bloodshed that if : coming social revolution necessarily involved ned insurrection it would find no general sanc- n. To the British people in particular the pros- :t of a period of convulsive effort of this character wholly without appeal. Revolution in this sense alien to the British character. Only in the last ort and as a final desperate expedient have the ople of this country consented to employ force to ain their ends. There have been times, of course, ıen the active opposition or dead inertia of the rul- ş classes have not been overcome until the people ve shown that they were bent on obtaining their

ends even at the cost of bloodshed. These occasions have not been numerous. They have been more in the nature of spontaneous popular uprisings than of deliberately planned insurrections. The British people have no aptitude for conspiracy. They are capable of vigorous action, of persistent and steady agitation year in and year out, of stubborn and resolute pressure against which nothing can stand; they have their moods of anger which may find expression in sporadic revolts: but they do not organise revolutions or plot the seizure of power by a sudden *coup d'état*. The growth of political democracy among us has been marked by few violent crises. Successive extensions of the franchise have been won mainly by agitations of a peaceful kind, accompanied in only a few cases by rioting, and organised revolution in the continental sense, for political or social ends, has been exceedingly rare in our history.

It would be idle, however, to deny that the temper of democracy after the war will not be so placable as it has hitherto been. Whether we like it or fear it, we have to recognise that in the course of the last three and a half years people have become habituated to thoughts of violence. They have seen force employed on an unprecedented scale as an instru-

ment of policy. Unless we are very careful these ideas will rule the thoughts of masses of the people in the post-war period of reconstruction. The idea that by forceful methods the organised democracy can find a short cut to the attainment of its aims will have its attractions for men of unstable temperament, impatient of the inevitable set-backs which we are bound to encounter if we work along constitutional lines. Let that idea stand unchallenged by the leaders of democracy, and we shall be faced with graver perils than any that have confronted us in past times. Never before have we had such vast numbers of the population skilled in the use of arms, disciplined, inured to danger, accustomed to act together under orders. When the war ends this country and every other will be flooded with hardy veterans of the great campaigns. Among them will be thousands of men who have exercised authority over their fellows in actual warfare, and who will be capable of assuming leadership again if insurrectionary movements come into existence. We may be warned by a perception of these facts that if barricades are indeed likely to be erected in our streets they will be manned by men who have learned how to fight and not by ill-disciplined mobs unversed in the use of modern wea-

pons, likely to be easily overcome by trained troops. Revolution, if revolution is indeed to be forced upon democracy, will be veritable civil war.

The prospect of social convulsions on this scale is enough to appal the stoutest heart. Yet this is the alternative that unmistakably confronts us, if we turn aside from the path of ordered social change by constitutional methods. The natural bias of organised Labour lies in the direction of smooth, orderly progress. When a deadlock is reached, as often happens in industrial disputes, the first appeal is always to the weapons of conciliation and arbitration. Negotiations usually end in a compromise: but the compromise generally represents a step forward. Labour is sometimes pictured as a blind giant, but unlike Samson it has sufficient wisdom to realise that in pulling down the pillars of the temple it may be crushed beneath the ruins along with its enemies. When the leaders of democracy speak of Revolution—thereby causing much alarm to ladies like Mrs. Humphrey Ward—they do not therefore contemplate any act of blind violence comparable to the brave stupidity of the Philistines' captive: they intend simply to warn the dominant classes that any attempt to keep democracy fettered and subordinate is foredoomed to failure. By peaceable methods, or by direct assault, society is going to be

brought under democratic control. And the choice of method does not primarily rest with democracy: it lies rather with the classes who own the machinery of production and control the machinery of the State to decide whether necessary changes are to be peaceably introduced on the basis of willing co-operation, or resisted to the last ditch. Conflicts will inevitably arise between the privileged classes and the great mass of the people as to whether this or that specific reform is opportune or expedient at a given moment. All that I am concerned with for the moment is the temper in which these reforms are to be approached—whether with a disposition to agree after full and frank discussion of the interests involved and the purpose to be achieved, or in a mood of sullen resistance hardening into a stupid refusal to discuss the question of reform at all. The latter mood will be fatal to our hopes of effecting a great and beneficent reconstruction of society by political methods.

It must not be forgotten that before the war there was a visible tendency on the party of a section of the people to resent the slow working of the machinery of Parliament. The war has not entirely obliterated our memory of the feverish industrial unrest which was such a significant feature of the situation in the years immediately preceding the outbreak of

war. There were many causes for it. But no one will deny that much of the trouble arose from the belief sedulously fostered by an active group of propagandists in the industrial arena that it was hopeless to expect Parliament to take any interest in the workers' grievances. Political action by the workers themselves was systematically discredited and discounted. The mass of the organised working class movement never lost faith in the Labour Party, and made full allowance for the difficulties under which their Parliamentary representatives worked. It is nevertheless true that the propaganda of "direct action" among the workers tended seriously to undermine belief in the efficacy of political methods. The opportunity of the anti-parliamentarian propagandists will recur if in the immediate future the Labour Party, by reason of its own weakness or the stubborn resistance of other parties and classes, is unable to fulfil the expectations of its followers. One good reason for beginning now to build up a strong democratic party in Parliament, with a programme of social and economic reforms carefully thought out in advance, is that such a party, having the confidence of the organised movement and conscious of its strength, will be able to prove that political methods are effective, and that Parliament can be made to legislate for the good

of the people as a whole rather than for the benefit of particular classes. The Labour Party can rehabilitate Parliament in the eyes of the people who have been wearied by the unreal strife of the orthodox parties, and by the cumbrous working of the Parliamentary machine in dealing with pressing and urgent questions of reform. The Labour Party sets out to prove by actual experiment and achievement that the Democratic State of to-morrow can be established without an intervening period of violent upheaval and dislocation.

The Revolution which the Labour Party seeks to bring about in this country will not be effected by means of bombs and bayonets. It will be, however, quite as thorough-going in its results as any violent convulsion involving the use of armed force can posssibly be. It means a radical change in the attitude of Parliament towards questions of social reform, a speeding up of the legislative machine, a resolute independence on the part of the Labour Party in Parliament. It means further a complete overhauling of the administrative machine. Experience has shown us that the great administrative services, swathed in red tape, hampered by tradition, conservative by instinct, saturated with class prejudice, are a more effective check upon the reforming impulse than even a Parliament dominated

by aristocratic and capitalist influences. We have no use for the Circumlocution Office. We want to see the Civil Service democratised. The Diplomatic Service, in particular, is an aristocratic preserve which offers no opportunity for a career to any man unless he possesses a private income of at least £400 a year, however well qualified he may otherwise be. The abolition of such a barrier is a democratic duty. In addition, we desire to bring the Foreign Office more directly under the control of Parliament, and to give the peoples' representatives larger powers of criticism in regard to foreign policy. So also with other Government Departments: we believe that their efficiency, energy, and enthusiasm for the public welfare will be greatly increased by an infusion of the spirit of democracy. Labour's aim is to establish democratic control over all the machinery of State. It can be done without a violent break with the past. Labour desires to make a swift and smooth transition to the new order, working along constitutional lines, not seeking to introduce innovations for the sake of novelty, but solely for the purpose of promoting political and social liberty and putting an end to oligarchical government and the domination of one class by another. To effect this transformation of the legislative and administrative machine it will not be necessary to spill blood.

CHAPTER VIII

FREEDOM

It is a tragic paradox that in the great struggle for freedom and democracy the British people have been required to surrender many of their cherished liberties. The nation's willingness to submit to restrictions imposed by authority upon the right of democratic self-determination which has been its chief pride and boast for many centuries is a more convincing proof of its resolute intention to achieve victory than even the sacrificial service of the men in the field and the workers at home. It is questionable, indeed, whether many of the limitations upon freedom were necessary; but it is indisputable that only a people motived by the purest patriotism, and resolved to allow nothing to weaken the national will, would have accepted them. At any other time the State's encroachment upon the domain of private liberty would have been instantly challenged. It was not because the British people were convinced that the surrender of democratic rights was necessary that they yielded without a struggle, but be-

cause they realised they could not prosecute two wars simultaneously. Having resolved to defeat Prussianism abroad because it menaced the freedom of the whole world, they tolerated the curtailment of their liberties at home as a relatively smaller danger with which they could more conveniently deal when the bigger peril was removed. Reaction has made great strides during the war. The people know that they are in the grip of reaction. But it would be a disastrous error to conclude that democracy has been so firmly fettered that it will not be able to shake off its bonds when the hour comes for it to reckon with its domestic enemies. The very submission of the people, their acceptance of one outrageous restriction after another, may lead the reactionaries to think their policy has succeeded: when the greater preoccupation of the war is over they will perhaps see how completely it has failed.

What are the reactionary encroachments upon liberty against which democracy may justly protest? We do not complain so much of the formal restrictions imposed upon the people of this country on the plea of national necessity, but of the subtler inroads upon both private and public liberty through a reactionary and oppressive interpretation of the long series of regulations introduced during the war. Take first the freedom of the press. An intelligent

censorship which confined its activities to the suppression of news that might assist the military effort of the enemy would be regarded as performing a legitimate duty: but the military censorship has developed into a wonderful political engine which enables the authorities systematically to control the press. It enables the executive not merely to control opinion but to manufacture it. On the one hand it prevents free discussion of questions of public policy; on the other it guides the public mind by means of a steady stream of artful suggestion and official "information" manipulated and coloured in accordance with official views. The seizure of pamphlets, the suppression of newspapers, the attempt to bring under the survey of the censorship every leaflet, pamphlet, and printed sheet dealing however remotely with questions of war and peace, are only additional illustrations of this dangerous development by which truth is rationed, political opinion made to order in government factories, and an artificial unity created by the simple expedient of denying expression to dissident views. The practical denial of free speech and the right of public meeting, both by direct prohibition and by the far worse method of permitting meetings to be broken up by organised violence, is another development against which democracy is bound to protest. Still

more sinister is the growth of espionage and police inquisition: the adoption of continental methods of surveillance represents an invasion of private life by the agents of authority which before the war one would have confidently declared this country would never tolerate. The right of asylum, under which many political refugees sought shelter from the harsh oppression of their own Governments, has been destroyed. The right of trial by jury and of public trial has been virtually superseded, and the detention of suspected persons without trial and without formal charge being made against them shows how far the executive has gone in defiance of the constitutional safeguards which protected the person and property of British citizens. New tribunals, unknown to the British legal system, and answerable only to the Government, have been set up for dealing with new offences, established principles of our juridical system, well attested rights of accused persons, have been arbitrarily set aside.

Before the war the workers enjoyed a considerable measure of personal and collective freedom, as workers not simply as citizens: they were not bound to one employer or confined to one district, but might go where the highest wages invited and in the last resort could enforce their claims for improved conditions by ceasing to work. These rights have

disappeared. Many workshop practices and customs which protected the workmen have been abandoned. That in the latter instance the workmen and their representatives have agreed to these limitations and restrictions does not weaken the assertion that they represent a serious diminution of the workers' freedom. With a patriotic self-devotion beyond all praise the organised workers have consented to abandon many of the guarantees which they had devised to protect them from the rapacity of the employers; but it cannot be denied that the manner in which their readiness to sacrifice their rights, including their right to decide for whom they shall work and under what conditions, has been exploited in the interest of reaction, has given rise to much suspicion and discontent. This very human reaction against all these legislative and administrative experiments is the measure of their failure. It proves that they have gone too far, are too harsh and oppressive in their working. They have given the workers a sense of being harried, controlled, and disposed of without any reference to their own wishes and frequently against their will. That is the root of the resentment and distrust which the organised workers now show. It is the reason why they scrutinise with jealous suspicion every proposal put forward by the Government for

the further organisation of the nation's reserves of man-power.

Not only the steadily deepening revolt of the organised workers but the equally marked degeneration of public *moral* and the loss of popular confidence in the Government, must be taken as further evidence of the total practical failure of this policy of repression and regimentation. In the early days of the war, those who, like myself, felt that the righteousness of our cause justified and indeed demanded every sacrifice, accepted the restrictions which the Government proposed as a necessary expedient for the vigorous prosecution of the war; and we have to bear our share of responsibility if we failed to perceive every possibility of abuse underlying the legal phrases in which the proposals were embodied. But democracy in war time is at a disadvantage in dealing with abuses or excesses of authority; its moral simplicity and singleness of aim put democracy in the power of its enemies. The same qualities will deliver it when the lesson of this experience of what reaction can do, how craftily the enemy of freedom can plot the destruction of popular liberties in the very hour when the people are making unprecedented sacrifices in order to preserve freedom and extend its boundaries, has been

learned. The people's sacrifice of their rights and liberties was sanctioned by motives of the purest patriotism. Those of us who counselled and encouraged the sacrifice when authoritative voices warned us that only so could the war be won have no reason to be ashamed: the shame rather lies with those who under cover of the plea of national necessity formulated regulations that have been a weapon in the hands of reaction for the subversion of civil liberty.

While we recognise that the logic of military defence is the logic of restriction, of authority against liberty, and acknowledge the difficulty of defining the limits of such control as a Government must claim when a nation is at war, we proclaim that the democratic ideal of freedom is not the freedom of a people in barracks or a besieged city, but of equality and mutual service. Militarist authority implies subservience and regimentation. Democracy demands the right of self-determination and the opportunity to realise through its own culture and institutions the fullest possibilities of self-development. The era of democratic freedom will not be inaugurated merely by a suspension of the war restrictions. It will be the function of the builders of the new order of society to discover the influences

that constrain freedom and by combined effort to destroy them. Democracy asserts that brute force should not be the arbiter in the relation of States, and therefore seeks to embody the principle of conciliation in international institutions. As the spirit of democracy will inform these international institutions and national self-determination is the guiding principle they will be the protectors of national freedom; and democracy, which is nourished on publicity, will demand that the free air of public discussion shall penetrate the obscurities of diplomacy. We realise further that there can be no true freedom so long as property and power are concentrated in the hands of a few, and the democratic watchword for the struggle of the future is "Through Equality to Freedom." We look to the democratisation of political institutions through a still wider extension of the franchise, the abolition of secret political funds, derived from the traffic in honours, and to the growth of industrial democracy, to enlarge the boundaries of freedom in this land, and to give the individual citizen a deeper sense of power and responsibility as the attributes of a free man. We know, too, that as the price of liberty is perpetual vigilance, so its surest safeguard is the passion for liberty in the hearts of men and women. To save this nation from the moral and political

servitude which makes the masses of people helpless agents of their own destruction and puts into the hands of the few more than the power of life and death is the settled resolve of organised democracy.

CHAPTER IX

VICTORY

VICTORY is a word on the lips of many people. It is a word which the statesmen of the Allied countries and of the Central Empires alike use quite freely, but with a very restricted application. To most the meaning of victory is limited to a striking military success. There is a grave danger that the moral as well as the social implications of victory may be forgotten or ignored. Any victory, however spectacular and dramatic in a military sense it may be, which falls short of the realisation of the ideals with which we entered the war, will not be a victory but a defeat. We strive for victory because we want to end war altogether, not merely to prove the superiority of British arms over those of Germany. We continue the struggle, dreadful though the cost of it has become, because we have to enforce reparation for a great wrong perpetrated upon a small unoffending nation, to liberate subject peoples and enable them to live under a form of government of their own

choosing, and to destroy, not a great nation, but a militarist autocracy which had deliberately planned war without considering the interests either of their own people or of the European Commonwealth of which they were a part.

For the people of this country these are still the objects of the war. The ideals with which we entered the struggle have not been lowered. On the contrary the aims of the people, the ends for which they are prepared still to suffer and serve, obscured though they may be by the clamant imperialism of the dominant class, have become a rooted resolve. They will not suffer the war aims of this country to be transformed into a programme of conquest and annexation. They will sanction only such territorial and political changes in Europe, Asia, and Africa as will make possible the creation of a society of free nations pledged to maintain peace, protected by mutual guarantees, extended to the small nations as well as great, against oppression and unfair attack from any warlike state. In seeking to attain these ends we ought not to rely entirely upon forces in the field; nor ought we to deceive ourselves by thinking that a military victory, however complete and overwhelming, will suffice to establish an international order in which there is no danger of future war. We desire a victory

which cannot be won wholly by the armies in the field. Sufficient use has not been made of the moral, political and diplomatic weapons which the Allies have at their disposal. There is a danger of substituting military success and the desire for territory for noble ideals and great principles. In thus subordinating the moral to the material we mock the sacrifice of our heroic dead and forget God, for which no military success can make amends. Long before the war had reached this present stage, a great moral offensive should have been launched, supplementing the military effort, with the object of bringing home to the hearts and minds of the enemy peoples the real truth about the war. Since conscience and reason do not end upon the frontiers of Central Europe, the democratic case, which the leaders of the popular movement in the Allied countries could present to the social democracy of Germany, would prove convincing enough to shorten the war materially. It would clarify the real issues of the war in every country. It is a grave fault on the part of those who direct Allied policy that they have so far neglected to use political and diplomatic as well as military methods to achieve victory.

When victory in the sense of the collapse of the military power in the Central Empires is at last achieved, we shall be confronted with the task of

translating military success into its political, economic, and social equivalents in this country and every other. It will not be a democratic victory if it results merely in the restoration of the capitalistic *régime* which the war has discredited and destroyed. Victory for the people means something more than the continuance of the old system of production for the profit of a small owning class, on the basis of wage-slavery for the producing classes. The hard, cruel, competitive system of production must be replaced by a system of co-operation under which the status of the workers will be revolutionised, and in which the squalor and poverty, the economic insecurity and social miseries of the past will have no place. This is the great task before the statesmen and politicians of the future.

Then we must remember that the coming period of reconstruction, even more than the remaining period of the war, will impose upon the leaders of all the civilised States new and searching tests of character and intellect. As we draw nearer to the end of the war we begin to see more clearly the magnitude of the problems that peace will bring. So vast, intricate, and fundamental have been the changes wrought during the last three and a half years that we are sometimes tempted to think the will and intelligence of men will be unequal to the task of

dealing with them. Still more may we fear sometimes that the problems of reconstruction will be handled by men too impatient to think things through, too tired and cynical to respond to the glowing faith in a finer future for the world which now inspires the multitudes of common people who have striven so heroically and suffered so patiently during the war. For national leadership to fall into the hands of such men in the great new days upon which we shall presently enter would be a disaster almost as great as the war itself. If there could be anything worse than an empiric in control of state policy when peace comes, it would be the influence of a cynic upon the splendid enthusiasm and revolutionary ardour of democracy, newly awakened to a consciousness of its power and eager to build a better future for mankind.

The outstanding fact of world politics at the present time—and when peace comes this fact will be made still more clear—is that a great tide of revolutionary feeling is rising in every country. Everywhere the peoples are becoming conscious of power. They are beginning to sit in judgment upon their rulers. They are beginning to ask questions about the policies that have brought the world to the edge of secular ruin. In this war the people have shown themselves capable of heroic sacrifices

and resolute endurance because they love liberty and desire peace. The hope that the issue of this war will be an increase of freedom, not only for themselves, but for those who have lived under the yoke of alien tyrannies, has sustained the people of this country throughout these years of war. It has caused them to pour out the blood of their best and bravest, to surrender hard-won liberties, to toil unremittingly in factory, field and mine, to spend without stint the material wealth accumulated through years of peace and prosperity. These sacrifices will not have been made in vain if the territorial and political changes to be made in Europe, Asia, and Africa embody the idea of public right, and establish an enduring peace between the nations that emperors, diplomatists, and capitalists will not be able to shake.

But the people will not choose to entrust their destinies at the Peace Conference to statesmen who have not perceived the moral significance of the struggle, and who are not prepared to make a people's peace. We want to replace the material force of arms by the moral force of right in the government of the world. For that great task of the immediate future we want national leaders who are not only responsive to the inspirations of democracy, but who are qualified to guide the mighty energies

of democracy in the task of building up the new social order.

Never before have the people been confronted with problems of greater magnitude, international and national, economic and political, social and personal; but never have they had so good an opportunity of taking hold of these problems for themselves. The policies and programmes of the orthodox parties have little relevance to the new situation. Political parties bound by tradition, saturated with class prejudice, out of touch with the living movements of thought and feeling among the people, cannot easily adapt themselves to the changed conditions, the new demands, the wider vision to which the war has given rise. The party of the future, upon which the chief tasks of reconstruction will devolve, will be the one which derives directly from the people themselves, and has been made the organ of the people's will, the voice of all the people—of both sexes and all classes—who work by hand or brain. Through such a party led by democratically chosen leaders who have proved their fidelity to principle and their faith in the people's cause, the best spirits of our time will be able to work as they have never been able to work in the orthodox parties of the past. Nothing but disunity and divided counsels in the democratic

movement can wreck the promise of the future. For every man and woman who believes in democracy and who desires to see a new birth of freedom in this land there is a place in the people's movement and a well-defined work to do. Despite the vast complications of our task, the duty of Christian citizenship has never been so clearly marked. In the past the democratic effort has been weak because it has been divided. During the war we have learnt the meaning of co-operation for common ends. The lesson holds good for the politics of to-morrow.

In a wider sense than has hitherto been understood the politics of the future will be human politics, and the dominating party will be the party of the common people and of democracy. This is certain. The people will have it so, for the people are weary of wars. They have borne too long the inequalities and injustices inherent in an economic system based on competition instead of co-operation. They are coming together in a more powerfully organised movement to achieve a new freedom, and to establish on this earth, drenched with men's blood, torn with men's struggles, wet with human tears, a fairer ideal of life.

CHAPTER X

THE SPIRIT OF DEMOCRACY

THE cruel ravages of the world war have caused a great resurgence of democratic feeling throughout the world, and have given a great impetus to the already strong popular tendencies towards democratic control in national and international affairs. It is impossible to calculate the extent to which democratic thought and ideals now permeate the peoples of the world: suffice it to say that in every country without exception the people's conception of the tremendous power that is invested in them constitutionally and divinely has been deepened. Though there is no divine right of kings and princes there is the divine right of peoples: and all the peoples of the earth are beginning to realise more and more each day that the "new kingdom on earth" can only be established by a full recognition of these divine rights—the rights of liberty and equality. These are the springs of democratic faith. They are the spiritual basis of real democracy.

The coming of world democracy means the uni-

versal reign of freedom and justice, equality and fraternity; the universal acceptance of the principle of equal opportunities for all peoples to self determination and self development; and a practical recognition of the rights and obligations of each nation as a member of the society of free nations. It also means a recognition of the interdependence of peoples, and involves international co-operation and goodwill.

In international affairs it means the welfare of the whole of humanity as against selfish national interests and ambitions. In national affairs it means the common weal as against class or individual interests. National prosperity cannot be truly appraised by the wealth of the few, but by the contentment and happiness of the community as a whole and their ability to satisfy, not only their social requirements, but also their spiritual needs. As Lecky has truly said, "The essential qualities of national greatness are moral, not material." Moral greatness may beget material prosperity, but material prosperity by itself invariably tends to a depreciation of the spiritual and moral: it dulls the finer sensibilities, and saps the real strength of a people. How often in the early days of war was the fear expressed that our great material prosperity had deadened many of the finest national qualities and

characteristics of our race? Fortunately for the future welfare of the people, they were not dead, but lying dormant, and the impulse to new life which they received in 1914 was so great that under the subsequent stress and strain of war the vision of the people became clearer, their sense of real values became finer and more keen, until now they are determined that henceforth only the best social structure that human knowledge, experience, and capacity can devise will satisfy their determination to rebuild civilisation on a foundation of justice and righteousness.

But it is hopeless to expect to create a healthy internationalism and a true nationalism unless the importance of the individual also is recognised. The society of nations is founded on the comity of individuals. And there is an obvious danger in over-looking the supreme importance of character as an indispensable factor in national and international life. Looking at every phase of national life we find a decided tendency to undervalue or ignore altogether the moral worth of the unit of society. We think in numbers: we act in numbers. Movements appeal to our minds, not always because they are right, but because they are popular. Many people talk about what is wrong with the world, the nation, or the municipality, but do not dream of

enquiring what is wrong with the individual. Yet the expression of the national will represents the greatest common measure of the views of the constituent individuals in the aggregate. And democracy can never rise to the full greatness of its possibilities unless the individual rises to the highest point of moral greatness. Men and women with low moral standards are the weakest links in the chain and the strength of the chain is limited to the strength of its weakest link. To secure an improvement in the material and social conditions of the people, we must elevate the moral standards of the people, since it is only possible to secure and consolidate vital changes as a result of the moral determination of the community as a whole. This question of the importance of the moral passion and rectitude of the individual is becoming daily more urgent in view of the significant rise and growing power of democracy in this country. The future welfare of the nation is in the hands of the organised democracy, and we are compelled to concern ourselves not only with intentions and practical aims, but with the faith, the ideals, and the personal qualities of leaders and followers. The difficulties before us are stupendous—Rome was not built in a day, and neither will the new national and international structure be completed in a day nor without heavy

demands being made upon the moral staying power of the people. To follow the line of least resistance will not bring us to the new world: the path will be long, difficult, and full of pitfalls.

If democracy is to take full advantage of the glorious opportunities before it, it can only be as a people individually strong in determination, and fired by moral passion and lofty ideals, led by men and women inspired to action by high purpose and unselfish ambition. Surely then, we cannot afford to ignore the question of personal character in our efforts to reach the Social ideal. The doctrine of personal irresponsibility is not only dangerous but an indication of a lack of vision on the part of those who advance it, and is often only employed to excuse an evasion of an individual's civic and social duties. The individual is not justified in claiming his national rights unless he fulfils his obligation to his fellow men and to the State: the State must recognise the rights of its citizens if it demands from them a fulfilment of their obligations as citizens. This is the sure way to stimulate a real personal and national consciousness upon which the success of democracy so much depends. Democracy will be effective in proportion to the intensity of its spiritual and moral faith; and the power of democracy as a whole will be measured by the loyalty of the in-

dividual to principle and by his belief in the moral power of right as against wrong. Character in the individual exemplifies human nature in its highest form, for it exhibits man at his best: and only a democracy built on the highest form of character will prove to be that instrument by which the world is to be saved.

APPENDIX I

INTER-ALLIED LABOUR WAR AIMS

The following is the full text of the "Memorandum on War Aims" adopted by the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference in London:

THE WAR

I.—The Inter-Allied Conference declares that whatever may have been the causes of the outbreak of war it is clear that the peoples of Europe, who are necessarily the chief sufferers from its horrors, had themselves no hand in it. Their common interest is now so to conduct the terrible struggle in which they find themselves engaged as to bring it, as soon as may be possible, to an issue in a secure and lasting peace for the world.

The Conference sees no reason to depart from the following declaration unanimously agreed to at the Conference of the Socialist and Labour Parties of the Allied Nations on February 14, 1915:

"This Conference cannot ignore the profound general causes of the European conflict, itself a monstrous product of the antagonisms which tear asunder capitalist society and of the policy of colonial dependencies and aggressive imperialism, against which International Socialism has never ceased to fight, and in which every government has its share of responsibility.

"The invasion of Belgium and France by the German armies threatens the very existence of independent nationalities and strikes a blow at all faith in treaties. In these circumstances a victory for German imperialism would be the defeat and the destruction of democracy and liberty in Europe. The Socialists of Great Britain, Belgium, France and Russia do not pursue the political and economic crushing of Germany; they are not at war with the peoples of Germany and Austria, but only with the governments of those countries by which they are oppressed. They demand that Belgium shall be liberated and compensated. They desire that the question of Poland shall be settled in accordance with the wishes of the Polish people, either in the sense of autonomy in the midst of another state, or in that of complete independence. They wish that throughout all Europe, from Alsace-Lorraine to the Balkans, those populations that have been annexed by force shall receive the right freely to dispose of themselves.

"While inflexibly resolved to fight until victory is achieved to ac-

complish this task of liberation, the Socialists are none the less resolved to resist any attempt to transform this defensive war into a war of conquest, which would only prepare fresh conflicts, create new grievances and subject various peoples more than ever to the double plague of armaments and war.

"Satisfied that they are remaining true to the principles of the International, the members of the Conference express the hope that the working classes of all the different countries will before long find themselves united again in their struggle against militarism and capitalist imperialism. The victory of the Allied Powers must be a victory for popular liberty, for unity, independence and autonomy of the nations in the peaceful federation of the United States of Europe and the world."

MAKING THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

II.—Whatever may have been the objects for which the war was begun the fundamental purpose of the Inter-Allied Conference in supporting the continuance of the struggle is that the world may henceforth be made safe for democracy.

Of all the conditions of peace none is so important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more war.

Whoever triumphs, the peoples will have lost unless an international system is established which will prevent war. What would it mean to declare the right of peoples to self-determination if this right were left at the mercy of new violations, and was not protected by a supernational authority? That authority can be no other than the League of Nations, in which not only all the present belligerents, but every other independent state, should be pressed to join.

The constitution of such a League of Nations implies the immediate establishment of an international High Court, not only for the settlement of all disputes between states that are of justiciable nature, but also for prompt and effective mediation between states in other issues that vitally interest the power or honour of such states. It is also under the control of the League of Nations that the consultation of peoples for purposes of self-determination must be organised. This popular right can be vindicated only by popular vote. The League of Nations shall establish the procedure of international jurisdiction, fix the methods which will maintain the freedom and security of the election, restore the political rights of individuals which violence and conquest may have injured, repress any attempt to use pressure or corruption, and prevent any subsequent reprisals. It will be also necessary to form an International Legislature, in which the representatives of every civilised state would have their allotted share and energetically to push forward, step by step, the development of international legislation agreed to by, and definitely binding upon, the several states.

By a solemn agreement all the states and peoples consulted shall pledge themselves to submit every issue between two or more of

them for settlement as aforesaid. Refusal to accept arbitration or to submit to the settlement will imply deliberate aggression, and all the nations will necessarily have to make common cause, by using any and every means at their disposal, either economical or military, against any state or states refusing to submit to the arbitration award, or attempting to break the world's covenant of peace.

But the sincere acceptance of the rules and decisions of the supernational authority implies complete democratisation in all countries; the removal of all the arbitrary powers who, until now, have assumed the right of choosing between peace and war; the maintenance or creation of legislatures elected by and on behalf of the sovereign right of the people; the suppression of secret diplomacy, to be replaced by the conduct of foreign policy under the control of popular legislatures, and the publication of all treaties, which must never be in contravention of the stipulation of the League of Nations, with the absolute responsibility of the government, and more particularly of the foreign minister of each country to its legislature.

Only such a policy will enforce the frank abandonment of every form of imperialism. When based on universal democracy, in a world in which effective international guarantees against aggression have been secured, the League of Nations will achieve the complete suppression of force as the means of settling international differences.

The League of Nations, in order to prepare for the concerted abolition of compulsory military service in all countries, must first take steps for the prohibition of fresh armaments on land and sea and for the common limitation of the existing armaments by which all the peoples are burdened; as well as the control of war manufactures and the enforcement of such agreements as may be agreed to thereupon. The states must undertake such manufactures themselves, so as entirely to abolish profit-making armament firms, whose pecuniary interest lies always in the war scares and progressive competition in the preparation for war.

The nations, being armed solely for self-defence and for such action as the League of Nations may ask them to take in defence of international right, will be left free, under international control either to create a voluntarily recruited force or to organise the nation for defense without professional armies for long terms of military service.

To give effect to the above principles, the Inter-Allied Conference declares that the rules upon which the League of Nations will be founded must be included in the treaty of peace, and will henceforth become the basis of the settlement of differences. In that spirit the Conference expresses its agreement with the propositions put forward by President Wilson in his last message:

(1) That each part of the final settlement must be based upon the essential justice of that particular case, and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent.

(2) That peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and

pawns in a game, even the great game now forever discredited of the balance of power; but that

(3) Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustments of compromise of claims amongst rival states.

(4) That all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe, and, consequently, of the world.

TERRITORIAL QUESTIONS

III.—The Inter-Allied Conference considers that the proclamation of principles of international law accepted by all nations, and the substitution of a regular procedure for the forceful acts by which states calling themselves sovereign have hitherto adjusted their differences—in short, the establishment of a League of Nations—gives an entirely new aspect to territorial problems.

The old diplomacy and the yearnings after domination by states, or even by peoples, which during the whole of the nineteenth century have taken advantage of and corrupted the aspirations of nationalities, have brought Europe to a condition of anarchy and disorder which have led inevitably to the present catastrophe.

The Conference declares it to be the duty of the Labor and Socialist movement to suppress without hesitation the imperialist designs in the various states which have led one government after another to seek, by the triumph of military force, to acquire either new territories or economic advantage.

The establishment of a system of international law and the guarantees afforded by a League of Nations, ought to remove the last excuse for those strategic protections which nations have hitherto felt bound to require.

It is the supreme principle of the right of each people to determine its own destiny that must now decide what steps should be taken by way of restitution or reparation, and whatever territorial readjustments may be found to be necessary at the close of the present war.

The Conference accordingly emphasises the importance to the labour and Socialist movement of a clear and exact definition of what is meant by the right of each people to determine its own destiny. Neither destiny of race nor identity of language can be regarded as affording more than a presumption in favour of federation or unification. During the nineteenth century the theories of this kind have so often served as a cloak for aggression that the International cannot but seek to prevent any recurrence of such an evil. Any adjustments of boundaries that become necessary must be based exclusively upon the desire of the people concerned.

It is true that it is impossible for the necessary consultation of

the desires of the people concerned to be made in any fixed and invariable way for all the cases in which it is required, and that the problems of nationality and territory are not the same for the inhabitants of all countries. Nevertheless, what is necessary in all cases is that the procedure to be adopted should be decided, not by one of the parties to the dispute, but by the super-national authority.

Upon the basis of the general principles herein formulated the Conference proposes the following solutions of particular problems:

(a) Belgium

The Conference emphatically insists that a foremost condition of peace must be the reparation by the German government, under the direction of an International Commission, of the wrong admittedly done to Belgium; payment by that government for all the damage that has resulted from this wrong; and the restoration of Belgium as an independent sovereign state, leaving to the decision of the Belgian people the determination of their own future policy in all respects.

(b) Alsace and Lorraine

The Conference declares that the problem of Alsace and Lorraine is not one of territorial adjustment, but one of right, and thus an international problem, the solution of which is indispensable if peace is to be either just or lasting.

The Treaty of Frankfort at one and the same time mutilated France and violated the right of the inhabitants of Alsace and Lorraine to dispose of their own destinies, a right which they have repeatedly claimed.

The new treaty of peace, in recognising that Germany by her declaration of war of 1914, has herself broken the Treaty of Frankfort, will make null and void the gains of a brutal conquest and of the violence committed against the people.

France, having secured this recognition, can properly agree to a fresh consultation of the population of Alsace and Lorraine as to its own desires.

The treaty of peace will bear the signatures of every nation in the world. It will be guaranteed by the League of Nations. To this League of Nations France is prepared to remit, with the freedom and sincerity of a popular vote, of which the details can be subsequently settled, the organisation of such a consultation as shall settle forever, as a matter of right, the future destiny of Alsace and Lorraine, and as shall finally remove from the common life of all Europe a quarrel which has imposed so heavy a burden upon it.

(c) The Balkans

The Conference lays down the principle that all the violations and perversions of the rights of the people which have taken place, or are still taking place, in the Balkans must be made the subject of redress or reparation.

Serbia, Montenegro, Rumania, Albania and all the territories occupied by military forces should be evacuated by the hostile forces. Wherever any population of the same race and tongue demands to be united this must be done. Each such people must be accorded full liberty to settle its own destiny, without regard to the imperialistic pretensions of Austria, Hungary, Turkey or other state.

Accepting this principle, the Conference proposes that the whole problem of the administrative reorganisation of the Balkan peoples should be dealt with by a special conference of their representatives or in case of disagreement by an authoritative international commission on the basis of (*a*) the concession within each independent sovereignty of local autonomy and security for the development of its particular civilisation of every racial minority; (*b*) the universal guarantee of freedom or religion and political equality for all races; (*c*) a Customs and Postal Union embracing the whole of the Balkan states with free access for each to its natural seaport; (*d*) the entry of all the Balkan states into a federation for the concerted arrangement by mutual agreement among themselves of all matters of common interest.

(d) Italy

The conference declares its warmest sympathy with the people of Italian blood and speech who have been left outside the boundaries that have, as a result of the diplomatic agreements of the past, and for strategic reasons, been assigned to the Kingdom of Italy, and supports their claim to be united with those of their own race and tongue. It realises that arrangements may be necessary for securing the legitimate interests of the people of Italy in the adjacent seas, but it condemns the aims of conquest of Italian Imperialism and believes that all legitimate needs can be safeguarded, without precluding a like recognition of the deeds of others or annexation of other people's territories.

Regarding the Italian population dispersed on the eastern shores of the Adriatic, the relations between Italy and the Yugo-Slav populations must be based on principles of equity and conciliation, so as to prevent any cause of future quarrel.

If there are found to be groups of Slavonian race within the newly defined Kingdom of Italy or groups of Italian race in Slavonian territory, mutual guarantees must be given for the assurance of all of them, on one side or the other, full liberty of local self-government and of the natural development of their several activities.

(e) Poland and the Baltic Provinces

In accordance with the right of every people to determine its own destinies, Poland must be reconstituted in unity and independence with free access to the sea.

The Conference declares further, that any annexation by Germany, whether open or disguised, of Livonia, Courland or Lithuania would be a flagrant and wholly inadmissible violation of international law.

(f) The Jews and Palestine

The Conference demands for the Jews in all countries the same elementary rights of freedom of religion, education, residence and trade and equal citizenship that ought to be extended to all the inhabitants of every nation. It further expresses the opinion that Palestine should be set free from the hard and oppressive government of the Turk, in order that this country may form a Free State, under international guarantee, to which such of the Jewish people as desire to do so may return and may work out their own salvation free from interference by those of alien race or religion.

(g) The Problem of the Turkish Empire

The Conference condemns the handing back to the systematically cruel domination of the Turkish government any subject people. Thus, whatever may be proposed with regard to Armenia, Mesopotamia and Arabia, they cannot be restored to the tyranny of the Sultan and his Pashas. The Conference condemns the imperialist aims of governments and capitalists who would make of these and other territories now dominated by the Turkish hordes merely instruments either of exploitation or militarism. If the peoples of these territories do not feel themselves able to settle their own destinies, the Conference insists that, conformably with the policy of "no annexations," they should be placed for administration in the hands of a Commission acting under the Super-National Authority or League of Nations. It is further suggested that the peace of the world requires that the Dardanelles should be permanently and effectively neutralised and opened like all the main lines of marine communication, under the control of the League of Nations, freely to all nations, without hindrance or customs duties.

(h) Austria-Hungary

The Conference does not propose as a war aim dismemberment of Austria-Hungary or its deprivation of economic access to the sea. On the other hand, the Conference cannot admit that the claims to independence made by the Czecho-Slovaks and the Yugo-Slavs must be regarded merely as questions for internal decision. National independence ought to be accorded, according to rules to be laid down by the League of Nations, to such peoples as demand it, and these communities ought to have the opportunity of determining their own groupings and federations according to their affinities and interests. If they think fit they are free to substitute a free federation of Danubian states for the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

(i) The Colonies and Dependencies

The International has always condemned the colonial policy of capitalist governments. Without ceasing to condemn it, the Inter-Allied Conference nevertheless recognises the existence of a state of things which it is obliged to take into account.

The Conference considers that the treaty of peace ought to secure to the natives in all colonies and dependencies effective protection against the excesses of capitalist colonialism. The Conference demands the concession of administrative autonomy for all groups of people that attain a certain degree of civilisation, and for all the others a progressive participation in local government.

The Conference is of opinion that the return of the colonies to those who possessed them before the war, or the exchange or compensations which might be effected, ought not to be an obstacle to the making of peace.

Those colonies that have been taken by conquest from any belligerent must be made the subject of special consideration at the Peace Conference, as to which the communities in their neighbourhood will be entitled to take part. But the clause in the treaty of peace on this point must secure economic equality in such territories for the peoples of all nations, and thereby guarantee that none are shut out from legitimate access to raw materials; prevented from disposing of their own products, or deprived of their proper share of economic development.

As regards more especially the colonies of all the belligerents in Tropical Africa, from sea to sea, including the whole of the region north of the Zambesi and south of the Sahara, the Conference condemns any imperialist idea which would make these countries the booty of one or several nations, exploit them for the profit of the capitalist or use them for the promotion of the militarist aims of the governments.

With respect to these colonies the Conference declares in favour of a system of control, established by international agreement, under the League of Nations and maintained by its guarantee, which, whilst respecting national sovereignty, would be alike inspired by broad conceptions of economic freedom and concerned to safeguard the rights of the natives under the best conditions possible for them, and in particular:

(1) It would take account in each locality of the wishes of the people, expressed in the form which is possible for them.

(2) The interests of the native tribes as regards the ownership of the soil would be maintained.

(3) The whole of the revenues would be devoted to the well-being and development of the colonies themselves.

ECONOMIC RELATIONS

IV. The Inter-Allied Conference declares against all the projects now being prepared by imperialists and capitalists, not in any one country only, but in most countries, for an economic war, after peace has been secured, either against one or other foreign nation or against all foreign nations, as such an economic war, if begun by any country, would inevitably lead to reprisals, to which each nation in turn might in self-defence be driven. The main lines of marine communication should be open without hindrance to vessels of all

nations under the protection of the League of Nations. The Conference realises that all attempts at economic aggression, whether by protective tariffs or capitalist trusts or monopolies, inevitably result in the spoliation of the working classes of the several countries for the profit of the capitalists; and the working classes see in the alliance between the military imperialists and the fiscal protectionists in any country whatsoever not only a serious danger to the prosperity of the masses of the people, but also a grave menace to peace. On the other hand, the right of each nation to the defence of its own economic interests, and in face of the world-shortage hereinafter mentioned, to the conservation for its own people of a sufficiency of its own supplies of foodstuffs and raw materials, cannot be denied. The Conference accordingly urges upon the labour and Socialist parties of all countries the importance of insisting, in the attitude of the government towards commercial enterprise, along with the necessary control of supplies for its own people, on the principle of the open door, and without hostile discrimination against foreign countries. But it urges equally the importance, not merely of conservation, but also of the utmost possible development, by appropriate government action, of the resources of every country for the benefit not only of its own people, but also of the world, and the need for an international agreement for the enforcement in all countries of the legislation on factory conditions, a maximum eight-hour day, the prevention of "sweating" and unhealthy trades necessary to protect the workers against exploitation and oppression, and the prohibition of night work by women and children.

THE PROBLEMS OF PEACE

V. To make the world safe for democracy involves much more than the prevention of war, either military or economic. It will be a device of the capitalist interests to pretend that the treaty of peace need concern itself only with the cessation of the struggles of the armed forces and with any necessary territorial readjustments. The Inter-Allied Conference insists that in view of the probable world-wide shortage, after the war, of exportable foodstuffs and raw materials, and of merchant shipping, it is imperative, in order to prevent the most serious hardships, and even possible famine, in one country or another, that systematic arrangements should be made on an international basis for the allocation and conveyance of the available exportable surpluses of these commodities to the different countries, in proportion, not to their purchasing powers, but to their several pressing needs; and that, within each country, the government must for some time maintain its control of the most indispensable commodities, in order to secure their appropriation, not in a competitive market mainly to the richer classes in proportion to their means, but, systematically, to meet the most urgent needs of the whole community on the principle of "no cake for any one until all have bread."

Moreover, it cannot but be anticipated that, in all countries, the

dislocation of industry attendant on peace, the instant discharge of millions of munition makers and workers in war trades, and the demobilisation of millions of soldiers—in face of the scarcity of industrial capital, the shortage of raw materials, and the insecurity of commercial enterprise—will, unless prompt and energetic action be taken by the several governments, plunge a large part of the wage-earning population into all the miseries of unemployment more or less prolonged. In view of the fact that widespread unemployment in any country, like a famine, is an injury not to that country alone, but impoverishes also the rest of the world, the Conference holds that it is the duty of every government to take immediate action, not merely to relieve the unemployed, when unemployment has set in, but actually, so far as may be practicable, to prevent the occurrence of unemployment. It therefore urges upon the labour parties of every country the necessity of their pressing upon their governments the preparation of plans for the execution of all the innumerable public works (such as the making and repairing of roads, railways and waterways, the erection of schools and public buildings, the provision of working-class dwellings and the reclamation and afforestation of land) that will be required in the near future, not for the sake of finding measures of relief for the unemployed, but with a view to these works being undertaken at such a rate in each locality as will suffice, together with the various capitalist enterprises that may be in progress, to maintain at a fairly uniform level year by year, and throughout each year, the aggregate demand for labour; and thus prevent there being any unemployed. It is now known that in this way it is quite possible for any government to prevent, if it chooses, the occurrence of any widespread or prolonged involuntary unemployment; which if it is now in any country allowed to occur, is as much the result of government neglect as is any epidemic disease.

RESTORATION OF THE DEVASTATED AREAS AND REPARATION OF WRONGDOING

VI. The Inter-Allied Conference holds that one of the most imperative duties of all countries immediately peace is declared will be the restoration, so far as may be possible, of the homes, farms, factories, public buildings and means of communication whatever destroyed by war operations; that the restoration should not be limited to compensation for public buildings, capitalist undertakings and material property proved to be destroyed or damaged, but should be extended to setting up the wage-earners and peasants themselves in homes and employment; and that to insure the full and impartial application of these principles the assessment and distribution of the compensation, so far as the cost is contributed by any international fund, should be made under the direction of an international Commission.

The Conference will not be satisfied unless there is a full and free judicial investigation into the accusations made on all sides that particular governments have ordered, and particular officers

have exercised, acts of cruelty, oppression, violence and theft against individual victims, for which no justification can be found in the ordinary usages of war. It draws attention in particular to the loss of life and property of merchant seamen and other non-combatants (including women and children) resulting from this inhuman and ruthless conduct. It should be part of the conditions of peace that there should be forthwith set up a Court of Claims and Accusations, which should investigate all such allegations as may be brought before it, summon the accused person or government to answer the complaint, to pronounce judgment, and award compensation or damages, payable by the individual or government condemned, to the persons who had suffered wrong, or to their dependents. The several governments must be responsible, financially and otherwise, for the presentation of the cases of their respective nationals to such a Court of Claims and Accusations, and for the payment of the compensation awarded.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

VII. The Inter-Allied Conference is of opinion that an International Conference of Labour and Socialist organisations, held under proper conditions, would at this stage render useful service to world democracy by assisting to remove misunderstandings, as well as the obstacles which stand in the way of world peace.

Awaiting the resumption of the normal activities of the International Socialist Bureau, we consider that an International Conference, held during the period of hostilities, should be organised by a committee whose impartiality cannot be questioned. It should be held in a neutral country, under such conditions as would inspire confidence; and the Conference should be fully representative of all the labour and Socialist movement in all the belligerent countries accepting the conditions under which the Conference is convoked.

As an essential condition to an International Conference the Commission is of opinion that the organisers of the Conference should satisfy themselves that all the organisations to be represented put in precise form, by a public declaration, their peace terms in conformity with the principles "no annexations or punitive indemnities, and the right of all peoples to self-determination," and that they are working with all their power to obtain from their governments the necessary guarantees to apply those principles honestly and unreservedly to all questions to be dealt with at any official peace conference.

In view of the vital differences between the Allied countries and the Central Powers, the Commission is of opinion that it is highly advisable that the Conference should be used to provide an opportunity for the delegates from the respective countries now in a state of war to make a full and frank statement of their present position and future intentions, and to endeavour by mutual agreement to arrange a programme of action for a speedy and democratic peace.

The Conference is of opinion that the working classes, having

made such sacrifices during the war, are entitled to take part in securing a democratic world peace, and that M. Albert Thomas (France), M. Emile Vandervelde (Belgium) and Mr Arthur Henderson (Great Britain) be appointed as a commission to secure from all the governments a promise that at least one representative of Labour and Socialism will be included in the official representation at any government conference, and to organise a Labour and Socialist representation to sit concurrently with the official conference; further, that no country be entitled to more than four representatives at such conference.

The Conference regrets the absence of representatives of American labour and Socialism from the Inter-Allied Conference, and urges the importance of securing their approval of the decisions reached. With this object in view, the Conference agrees that a deputation, consisting of one representative from France, Belgium, Italy and Great Britain, together with Camille Huysmans (Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau), proceed to the United States at once, in order to confer with representatives of the American democracy on the whole situation of the war.

The Conference resolves to transmit to the Socialists of the Central Empires and of the nations allied with them the memorandum in which the Conference has defined the conditions of peace, conformably with the principles of Socialist and international justice. The Conference is convinced that these conditions will commend themselves on reflection to the mind of every Socialist, and the Conference asks for the answer of the Socialists of the Central Empires, in the hope that these will join without delay in a joint effort of the International, which has now become more than ever the best and the most certain instrument of democracy and peace.

APPENDIX II

BOUR AND THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER

A DRAFT REPORT ON RE-CONSTRUCTION

'he following Draft Report on the General Policy of the Party on onstruction" has been prepared by a Sub-Committee of the utive for the consideration of the Party; and is submitted by the utive to the annual Conference at Nottingham, not for adoption vith a view to its being specially referred to the constituent organ- ons for discussion and eventual submission to the Party Confer- to be arranged for June next, or a special Conference should a ral Election render it necessary.]

behoves the Labour Party, in formulating its own programme Reconstruction after the war, and in criticising the various arations and plans that are being made by the present Govern- , to look at the problem as a whole. We have to make it clear it is that we wish to construct. It is important to emphasise act that, whatever may be the case with regard to other political es, our detailed practical proposals proceed from definitely held iples.

THE END OF A CIVILISATION

e need to beware of patchwork. The view of the Labour Party at what has to be reconstructed after the war is not this or that rnment Department, or this or that piece of social machinery; so far as Britain is concerned, society itself. The individual er, or for that matter the individual statesman, immersed in routine—like the individual soldier in a battle—easily fails to rstand the magnitude and far-reaching importance of what is g place around him. How does it fit together as a whole? does it look from a distance? Count Okuma, one of the oldest, experienced and ablest of the statesmen of Japan, watching the nt conflict from the other side of the globe, declares it to be ing less than the death of European civilisation. Just as in the the civilisations of Babylon, Egypt, Greece, Carthage, and the Roman Empire have been successively destroyed, so, in the ment of this detached observer, the civilisation of all Europe is now receiving its death-blow. We of the Labour Party can ar agree in this estimate as to recognise, in the present world trophe, if not the death, in Europe, of civilisation itself, at any

rate the culmination and collapse of a distinctive industrial civilisation, which the workers will not seek to reconstruct. At such times of crisis it is easier to slip into ruin than to progress into higher forms of organisation. That is the problem as it presents itself to the Labour Party to-day.

What this war is consuming is not merely the security, the homes, the livelihood and the lives of millions of innocent families, and an enormous proportion of all the accumulated wealth of the world, but also the very basis of the peculiar social order in which it has arisen. The individualist system of capitalist production, based on the private ownership and competitive administration of land and capital, with its reckless "profiteering" and wage-slavery; with its glorification of the unhampered struggle for the means of life and its hypocritical pretence of the "survival of the fittest"; with the monstrous inequality of circumstances which it produces and the degradation and brutalisation, both moral and spiritual, resulting therefrom, may, we hope, indeed have received a death-blow. With it must go the political system and ideas in which it naturally found expression. We of the Labour Party, whether in opposition or in due time called upon to form an Administration, will certainly lend no hand to its revival. On the contrary, we shall do our utmost to see that it is buried with the millions whom it has done to death. If we in Britain are to escape from the decay of civilisation itself, which the Japanese statesman foresees, we must ensure that what is presently to be built up is a new social order, based not on fighting, but on fraternity—not on the competitive struggle for the means of bare life, but on a deliberately planned co-operation in production and distribution for the benefit of all who participate by hand or by brain—not on the utmost possible inequality of riches, but on a systematic approach towards a healthy equality of material circumstances for every person born into the world—not on an enforced dominion over subject nations, subject races, subject Colonies, subject classes or a subject sex, but, in industry as well as in government, on that equal freedom, that general consciousness of consent, and that widest possible participation in power, both economic and political, which is characteristic of Democracy. We do not, of course pretend that it is possible, even after the drastic clearing away that is now going on, to build society anew in a year or two of feverish "Reconstruction." What the Labour Party intends to satisfy itself about is that each brick that it helps to lay shall go to erect the structure that it intends, and no other.

THE PILLARS OF THE HOUSE

We need not here recapitulate, one by one, the different items in the Labour Party's programme, which successive Party Conferences have adopted. These proposals, some of them in various publications worked out in practical detail, are often carelessly derided as impracticable, even by the politicians who steal them piecemeal from us! The members of the Labour Party, themselves actually

working by hand or by brain, in close contact with the facts, have perhaps at all times a more accurate appreciation of what is practicable, in industry as in politics, than those who depend solely on academic instruction or are biased by great possessions. But to-day no man dares to say that anything is impracticable. The war, which has scared the old Political Parties right out of their dogmas, has taught every statesman and every Government official, to his enduring surprise, how very much more can be done along the lines that we have laid down than he had ever before thought possible. What we now promulgate as our policy, whether for opposition or for office, is not merely this or that specific reform, but a deliberately thought-out, systematic, and comprehensive plan for that immediate social rebuilding which any Ministry, whether or not it desires to grapple with the problem, will be driven to undertake. The Four Pillars of the House that we propose to erect, resting upon the common foundation of the Democratic control of society in all its activities, may be termed, respectively:

(*a*) The Universal Enforcement of the National Minimum;
(*b*) The Democratic Control of Industry;
(*c*) The Revolution in National Finance; and
(*d*) The Surplus Wealth for the Common Good.

The various detailed proposals of the Labour Party, herein briefly summarised, rest on these four pillars, and can best be appreciated in connection with them.

THE UNIVERSAL ENFORCEMENT OF A NATIONAL MINIMUM

The first principle of the Labour Party—in significant contrast with those of the Capitalist System, whether expressed by the Liberal or by the Conservative Party—is the securing to every member of the community, in good times and bad alike (and not only to the strong and able, the well-born or the fortunate), of all the requisites of healthy life and worthy citizenship. This is in no sense a "class" proposal. Such an amount of social protection of the individual, however poor and lowly, from birth to death is, as the economist now knows, as indispensable to fruitful co-operation as it is to successful combination; and it affords the only complete safeguard against that insidious Degradation of the Standard of Life, which is the worst economic and social calamity to which any community can be subjected. We are members one of another. No man liveth to himself alone. If any, even the humblest is made to suffer, the whole community and every one of us, whether or not we recognise the fact, is thereby injured. Generation after generation this has been the corner-stone of the faith of Labour. It will be the guiding principle of any Labour Government.

The Legislative Regulation of Employment

Thus it is that the Labour Party to-day stands for the universal application of the Policy of the National Minimum, to which (as

embodied in the successive elaborations of the Factory, Mines, Railways, Shops, Merchant Shipping, and Truck Acts, the Public Health, Housing, and Education Acts and the minimum Wage Act—all of them aiming at the enforcement of at least the prescribed Minimum of Leisure, Health, Education, and Subsistence) the spokesmen of Labour have already gained the support of the enlightened statesmen and economists of the world. All these laws purporting to protect against extreme Degradation of the Standard of Life need considerable improvement and extension, whilst their administration leaves much to be desired. For instance, the Workmen's Compensation Act fails, shamefully, not merely to secure proper provision for all the victims of accident and industrial disease, but what is much more important, does not succeed in preventing their continual increase. The amendment and consolidation of the Factories and Workshop Acts, with their extension to all employed persons, is long overdue, and it will be the policy of Labour greatly to strengthen the staff of inspectors, especially by the addition of more men and women of actual experience of the workshop and the mine. The Coal Mines (Minimum Wage) Act must certainly be maintained in force, and suitably amended, so as both to ensure greater uniformity of conditions among the several districts, and to make the District Minimum in all cases an effective reality. The same policy will, in the interests of the agricultural labourers, dictate the perpetuation of the Legal Wage clauses of the new Corn Law just passed for a term of five years, and the prompt amendment of any defects that may be revealed in their working. And, in view of the fact that many millions of wage-earners, notably women and the less-skilled workmen in various occupations, are unable by combination to obtain wages adequate for decent maintenance in health, the Labour Party intends to see that the Trade Boards Act is suitably amended and made to apply to all industrial employments in which any considerable number of those employed obtain less than 30s. per week. This minimum of not less than 30s. per week (which will need revision according to the level of prices) ought to be the very lowest statutory base line for the least skilled adult workers, men or women, in any occupation, in all parts of the United Kingdom.

The Organisation of Demobilisation

But the coming industrial dislocation, which will inevitably follow the discharge from war service of half of all the working population, imposes new obligations upon the community. The demobilisation and discharge of the eight million wage-earners now being paid from public funds, either for service with the colours or in munition work and other war trades, will bring to the whole wage-earning class grave peril of Unemployment, Reduction of Wages, and a Lasting Degradation of the Standard of Life, which can be prevented only by deliberate National Organisation. The Labour Party has repeatedly called upon the present Government to formulate its plan, and to make in advance all arrangements

necessary for coping with so unparalleled a dislocation. The policy to which the Labour Party commits itself is unhesitating and uncompromising. It is plain that regard should be had, in stopping Government orders, reducing the staff of the National Factories and demobilising the Army, to the actual state of employment in particular industries and in different districts, so as both to release first the kinds of labour most urgently required for the revival of peace production, and to prevent any congestion of the market. It is no less imperative that suitable provision against being turned suddenly adrift without resources should be made, not only for the soldiers, but also for the three million operatives in munition work and other war trades, who will be discharged long before most of the Army can be disbanded. On this important point, which is the most urgent of all, the present Government has, we believe, down to the present hour, formulated no plan, and come to no decision, and neither the Liberal nor the Conservative Party has apparently deemed the matter worthy of agitation. Any Government which should allow the discharged soldier or munition worker to fall into the clutches of charity or the Poor Law would have to be instantly driven from office by an outburst of popular indignation. What every one of them who is not wholly disabled will look for is a situation in accordance with his capacity.

Securing Employment for All

The Labour Party insists—as no other political party has thought fit to do—that the obligation to find suitable employment in productive work for all these men and women rests upon the Government for the time being. The work of re-settling the disbanded soldiers and discharged munition workers into new situations is a national obligation; and the Labour Party emphatically protests against it being regarded as a matter for private charity. It strongly objects to this public duty being handed over either to committees of philanthropists or benevolent societies, or to any of the military or recruiting authorities. The policy of the Labour Party in this matter is to make the utmost use of the Trade Unions, and equally for the brain workers, of the various Professional Associations. In view of the fact that, in any trade, the best organisation for placing men in situations is a national Trade Union having local branches throughout the kingdom, every soldier should be allowed, if he chooses, to have a duplicate of his industrial discharge notice sent out, one month before the date fixed for his discharge, to the Secretary of the Trade Union to which he belongs or wishes to belong. Apart from this use of the Trade Union (and a corresponding use of the Professional Association) the Government must, of course, avail itself of some such public machinery as that of the Employment Exchanges; but before the existing Exchanges (which will need to be greatly extended) can receive the co-operation and support of the organised Labour Movement, without which their operations can never be fully successful, it is imperative that they should be drasti-

cally reformed, on the lines laid down in the Demobilisation Report of the "Labour after the War" Joint Committee; and, in particular, that each Exchange should be placed effectively under the supervision and control of a Joint Committee of Employers and Trade Unionists in equal numbers.

The responsibility of the Government, for the time being, in the grave industrial crisis that demobilisation will produce, goes, however, far beyond the eight million men and women whom the various departments will suddenly discharge from their own service. The effect of this peremptory discharge on all the other workers has also to be taken into account. To the Labour Party it will seem the supreme concern of the Government of the day to see to it that there shall be, as a result of the gigantic "General Post" which it will itself have deliberately set going, nowhere any Degradation of the Standard of Life. The Government has pledged itself to restore the Trade Union conditions and "pre-war practices" of the workshop, which the Trade Unions patriotically gave up at the direct request of the Government itself; and this solemn pledge must be fulfilled, of course, in the spirit as well as in the letter. The Labour Party, moreover, holds it to be the duty of the Government of the day to take all necessary steps to prevent the Standard Rates of Wages, in any trade or occupation whatsoever, from suffering any reduction, relatively to the contemporary cost of living. Unfortunately, the present Government, like the Liberal and Conservative Parties, so far refuses to speak on this important matter with any clear voice. We claim that it should be a cardinal point of Government policy to make it plain to every capitalist employer that any attempt to reduce the customary rate of wages when peace comes, or to take advantage of the dislocation of demobilisation to worsen the conditions of employment in any grade whatsoever, will certainly lead to embittered industrial strife, which will be in the highest degree detrimental to the national interests; and that the Government of the day will not hesitate to take all necessary steps to avert such a calamity. In the great impending crisis the Government of the day should not only, as the greatest employer of both brainworkers and manual workers, set a good example in this respect but should also actively seek to influence private employers by proclaiming in advance that it will not itself attempt to lower the Standard Rates of conditions in public employment; by announcing that it will insist on the most rigorous observance of the Fair Wages Clause in all public contracts, and by explicitly recommending every Local Authority to adopt the same policy.

But nothing is more dangerous to the Standard of Life, or so destructive of those minimum conditions of healthy existence, which must in the interests of the community be assured to every worker, than any widespread or continued unemployment. It has always been a fundamental principle of the Labour Party (a point on which significantly enough it has not been followed by either of the other political parties) that in a modern industrial community, it is one of the foremost obligations of the Government to find, for every willing

worker, whether by hand or by brain, productive work at Standard Rates.

It is accordingly the duty of the Government to adopt a policy of deliberately and systematically preventing the occurrence of unemployment, instead of (as heretofore) letting unemployment occur, and then seeking, vainly and expensively, to relieve the unemployed. It is now known that the Government can, if it chooses, arrange the Public Works and the orders of National Departments and Local Authorities in such a way as to maintain the aggregate demand for labour in the whole kingdom (including that of capitalist employers) approximately at a uniform level from year to year; and it is therefore a primary obligation of the Government to prevent any considerable or widespread fluctuations in the total numbers employed in times of good or bad trade. But this is not all. In order to prepare for the possibility of there being any unemployment, either in the course of demobilisation or in the first years of peace, it is essential that the Government should make all necessary preparations for putting instantly in hand, directly or through the Local Authorities, such urgently needed public works as (*a*) the rehousing of the population alike in rural districts, mining villages, and town slums, to the extent, possibly, of a million new cottages and an outlay of 300 millions sterling; (*b*) the immediate making good of the shortage of schools, training colleges, technical colleges, &c., and the engagement of the necessary additional teaching, clerical and administrative staffs; (*c*) new roads; (*d*) light railways; (*e*) the unification and reorganisation of the railway and canal system; (*f*) afforestation; (*g*) the reclamation of land; (*h*) the development and better equipment of our ports and harbours; (*i*) the opening up of access to land by co-operative small holdings and in other practicable ways. Moreover, in order to relieve any pressure of an overstocked labour market, the opportunity should be taken, if unemployment should threaten to become widespread, (*a*) immediately to raise the school leaving age to sixteen; (*b*) greatly to increase the number of scholarships and bursaries for Secondary and Higher Education; and (*c*) substantially to shorten the hours of labour of all young persons, even to a greater extent than the eight hours per week contemplated in the new Education Bill, in order to enable them to attend technical and other classes in the daytime. Finally, wherever practicable, the hours of adult labour should be reduced to not more than forty-eight per week, without reduction of the Standard Rates of Wages. There can be no economic or other justification for keeping any man or woman to work for long hours, or at overtime, whilst others are unemployed.

Social Insurance Against Unemployment

In so far as the Government fails to prevent Unemployment—wherever it finds it impossible to discover for any willing worker, man or woman, a suitable situation at the Standard Rate—the Labour Party holds that the Government must, in the interest of

the community as a whole, provide him or her with adequate maintenance, either with such arrangements for honourable employment or with such useful training as may be found practicable, according to age, health and previous occupation. In many ways the best form of provision for those who must be unemployed, because the industrial organisation of the community so far breaks down as to be temporarily unable to set them to work, is the Out of Work Benefit afforded by a well administered Trade Union. This is a special tax on the Trade Unionists themselves which they have voluntarily undertaken, but towards which they have a right to claim a public subvention—a subvention which was actually granted by Parliament (though only to the extent of a couple of shillings or so per week) under Part II. of the Insurance Act. The arbitrary withdrawal by the Government in 1915 of this statutory right of the Trade Unions was one of the least excusable of the war economies; and the Labour Party must insist on the resumption of this subvention immediately the war ceases, and on its increase to at least half the amount spent in Out of Work Benefit. The extension of State Unemployment Insurance to other occupations may afford a convenient method of providing for such of the Unemployed, especially in the case of badly paid women workers, and the less skilled men, whom it is difficult to organise in Trade Unions. But the weekly rate of the State Unemployment Benefits needs, in these days of high prices, to be considerably raised; whilst no industry ought to be compulsorily brought within its scope against the declared will of the workers concerned, and especially of their Trade Unions. In one way or another remunerative employment or honourable maintenance must be found for every willing worker, by hand or by brain, in bad times as well as in good. It is clear that, in the twentieth century, there must be no question of driving the Unemployed to anything so obsolete and discredited as either private charity, with its haphazard and ill-considered doles, or the Poor Law, with the futilities and barbarities of its "Stone Yard," or its "Able-bodied Test Workhouse." Only on the basis of a universal application of the Policy of the National Minimum, affording complete security against destitution, in sickness and health, in good times and bad alike, to every member of the community of whatever age or sex, can any worthy social order be built up.

THE DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF INDUSTRY

The universal application of the Policy of the National Minimum is, of course, only the first of the Pillars of the House that the Labour Party intends to see built. What marks off this Party most distinctively from any of the other political parties is its demand for the full and genuine adoption of the principle of Democracy. The first condition of Democracy is effective personal freedom. This has suffered so many encroachments during the war that it is necessary to state with clearness that the complete removal of all the war-time restrictions on freedom of speech, freedom of publication,

freedom of the press, freedom of travel and freedom of choice of place of residence and kind of employment must take place the day after Peace is declared. The Labour Party declared emphatically against any continuance of the Military Service Acts a moment longer than the imperative requirements of the war excuse. But individual freedom is of little use without complete political rights. The Labour Party sees its repeated demands largely conceded in the present Representation of the People Act, but not yet wholly satisfied. The Party stands, as heretofore, for complete Adult Suffrage, with not more than a three months' residential qualification, for effective provision for absent electors to vote, for absolutely equal rights for both sexes, for the same freedom to exercise civic rights for the "common soldier" as for the officer, for Shorter Parliaments, for the complete Abolition of the House of Lords, and for a most strenuous opposition to any new Second Chamber, whether elected or not, having in it any element of Heredity or Privilege, or of the control of the House of Commons by any party or class. But unlike the Conservative and Liberal Parties, the Labour Party insists on Democracy in industry as well as in government. It demands the progressive elimination from the control of industry of the private capitalist, individual or joint-stock; and the setting free of all who work, whether by hand or by brain, for the service of the community, and of the community only. And the Labour Party refuses absolutely to believe that the British people will permanently tolerate any reconstruction or perpetuation of the disorganisation, waste and inefficiency involved in the abandonment of British industry to a jostling crowd of separate private employers, with their minds bent, not on the service of the community, but—by the very law of their being—only on the utmost possible profiteering. What the nation needs is undoubtedly a great bound onwards in its aggregate productivity. But this cannot be secured merely by pressing the manual workers to more strenuous toil, or even by encouraging the "Captains of Industry" to a less wasteful organisation of their several enterprises on a profit-making basis. What the Labour Party looks to is a genuinely scientific reorganisation of the nation's industry, no longer deflected by individual profiteering, on the basis of the Common Ownership of the means of Production; the equitable sharing of the proceeds among all who participate in any capacity and only among these, and the adoption, in particular services and occupation, of those systems and methods of administration and control that may be found, in practice, best to promote, not profiteering, but the public interest.

Immediate Nationalisation

The Labour Party stands not merely for the principle of the Common Ownership of the nation's land, to be applied as suitable opportunities occur, but also, specifically, for the immediate Nationalisation of Railways, Mines, and the production of Electrical Power. We hold that the very foundation of any successful re-

organisation of British Industry must necessarily be found in the provision of the utmost facilities for transport and communication, the production of power at the cheapest possible rate, and the most economical supply of both electrical energy and coal to every corner of the kingdom. Hence the Labour Party stands, unhesitatingly, for the National Ownership and administration of the Railways and Canals, and their union, along with Harbours and Roads and the Posts and Telegraphs—not to say also the great lines of steamers which could at once be owned, if not immediately directly managed in detail, by the Government—in a united national service of Communication and Transport; to be worked, unhampered by capitalist, private or purely local interests (and with a steadily increasing participation of the organised workers in the management, both central and local), exclusively for the common good. If any Government should be so misguided as to propose, when peace comes, to hand the railways back to the shareholders; or should show itself so spendthrift of the nation's property as to give these shareholders any enlarged franchise by presenting them with the economies of unification or the profits of increased railway rates; or so extravagant as to bestow public funds on the re-equipment of privately owned lines—all of which things are now being privately intrigued for by the railway interests—the Labour Party will offer any such project the most strenuous opposition. The railways and canals, like the roads, must henceforth belong to the public, and to the public alone.

In the production of Electricity, for cheap Power, Light and Heating, this country has so far failed, because of hampering private interests, to take advantage of science. Even in the largest cities we still "peddle" our Electricity on a contemptibly small scale. What is called for, immediately after the war, is the erection of a score of gigantic "super-power stations," which could generate, at incredibly cheap rates, enough electricity for the use of every industrial establishment and every private household in Great Britain; the present municipal and joint-stock electrical plants being universally linked up and used for local distribution. This is inevitably the future of Electricity. It is plain that so great and so powerful an enterprise, affecting every industrial enterprise and, eventually every household, must not be allowed to pass into the hands of private capitalists. They are already pressing the Government for the concession, and neither the Liberal nor the Conservative Party has yet made up its mind to a refusal of such a new endowment of profiteering in what will presently be the life-blood of modern productive industry. The Labour Party demands that the production of Electricity on the necessary gigantic scale shall be made, from the start (with suitable arrangements for municipal co-operation in local distribution), a national enterprise, to be worked exclusively with the object of supplying the whole kingdom with the cheapest possible Power, Light, and Heat.

But with the Railways and the generation of Electricity in the hands of the public, it would be criminal folly to leave to the present 1,500 colliery companies the power of "holding up" the coal supply.

These are now all working under public control, on terms that virtually afford to their shareholders a statutory guarantee of their swollen incomes. The Labour Party demands the immediate Nationalisation of Mines, the extraction of coal and iron being worked as a public service (with a steadily increasing participation in the management, both central and local, of the various grades of persons employed); and the whole business of the retail distribution of household coal being undertaken, as a local public service, by the elected Municipal or County Councils. And there is no reason why coal should fluctuate in price any more than railway fares, or why the consumer should be made to pay more in winter than in summer, or in one town than another. What the Labour Party would aim at is, for household coal of standard quality, a fixed and uniform price for the whole kingdom, payable by rich and poor alike, as unalterable as the penny postage stamp.

But the sphere of immediate Nationalisation is not restricted to these great industries. We shall never succeed in putting the gigantic system of Health Insurance on a proper footing, or secure a clear field for the beneficent work of the Friendly Societies, or gain a free hand for the necessary development of the urgently called for Ministry of Health and the Local Public Health Service, until the nation expropriates the profit-making Industrial Insurance Companies, which now so tyrannously exploit the people with their wasteful house-to-house Industrial Life Assurance. Only by such an expropriation of Life Assurance Companies can we secure the universal provision, free from the burdensome toll of weekly pence, of the indispensable Funeral Benefit. Nor is it in any sense a "class" measure. Only by the assumption by a State Department of the whole business of Life Assurance can the millions of policy holders of all classes be completely protected against the possibly calamitous results of the depreciation of securities and suspension of bonuses which the war is causing. Only by this means can the great staff of insurance agents find their proper place as Civil Servants, with equitable conditions of employment, compensation for any disturbance and security of tenure, in a nationally organised public service for the discharge of the steadily increasing functions of the Government in Vital Statistics and Social Insurance.

In quite another sphere the Labour Party sees the key to Temperance Reform in taking the entire manufacture and retailing of alcoholic drink out of the hands of those who find profit in promoting the utmost possible consumption. This is essentially a case in which the people, as a whole, must assert its right to full and unfettered power for dealing with the licensing question in accordance with local opinion. For this purpose, localities should have conferred upon them facilities

(*a*) To prohibit the sale of liquor within their boundaries;

(*b*) To reduce the number of licences and regulate the conditions under which they may be held; and

(*c*) If a locality decides that licences are to be granted, to determine whether such licences shall be under private or any form of public control.

Municipalisation

Other main industries, especially those now becoming monopolised, should be nationalised as opportunity offers. Moreover, the Labour Party holds that the Municipalities should not confine their activities to the necessarily costly services of Education, Sanitation and Police; nor yet rest content with acquiring control of the local Water, Gas, Electricity, and Tramways; but that every facility should be afforded to them to acquire (easily, quickly and cheaply) all the land they require, and to extend their enterprises in Housing and Town Planning, Parks, and Public Libraries, the provision of music and the organisation of recreation; and also to undertake, besides the retailing of coal, other services of common utility, particularly the local supply of milk, wherever this is not already fully and satisfactorily organised by a Co-operative Society.

Control of Capitalist Industry

Meanwhile, however, we ought not to throw away the valuable experience now gained by the Government in its assumption of the importation of wheat, wool, metals, and other commodities, and in its control of the shipping, woollen, leather, clothing, boot and shoe, milling, baking, butchering, and other industries. The Labour Party holds that, whatever may have been the shortcomings of this Government importation and control, it has demonstrably prevented a lot of "profiteering." Nor can it end immediately on the Declaration of Peace. The people will be extremely foolish if they ever allow their indispensable industries to slip back into the unfettered control of private capitalists, who are, actually at the instance of the Government itself, now rapidly combining, trade by trade, into monopolist Trusts, which may presently become as ruthless in their extortion as the worst American examples. Standing as it does for the Democratic Control of Industry, the Labour Party would think twice before it sanctioned any abandonment of the present profitable centralisation of purchase of raw materials; of the present carefully organised "rationing," by joint committees of the trades concerned, of the several establishments with the materials they require; of the present elaborate system of "costing" and public audit of manufacturers' accounts, so as to stop the waste heretofore caused by the mechanical inefficiency of the more backward firms; of the present salutary publicity of manufacturing processes and expenses thereby ensured; and, on the information thus obtained (in order never again to revert to the old-time profiteering) of the present rigid fixing, for standardised products, of maximum prices at the factory, at the warehouse of the wholesale trader and in the retail shop. This question of the retail prices of household commodities is emphatically the most practical of all political issues to the woman elector. The male politicians have too long neglected the grievances of the small household, which is the prey of every profiteering combination; and neither the Liberal nor the Conservative party promises, in this respect, any amendment.

This, too, is in no sense a "class" measure. It is, so the Labour Party holds, just as much the function of Government, and just as necessary a part of the Democratic Regulation of Industry, to safeguard the interests of the community as a whole, and those of all grades and sections of private consumers, in the matter of prices, as it is, by the Factory and Trade Boards Acts, to protect the rights of the wage-earning producers in the matter of wages, hours of labour, and sanitation.

A REVOLUTION IN NATIONAL FINANCE

In taxation, also, the interests of the professional and housekeeping classes are at one with those of the manual workers. Too long has our National Finance been regulated, contrary to the teaching of Political Economy, according to the wishes of the possessing classes and the profits of the financiers. The colossal expenditure involved in the present war (of which, against the protest of the Labour Party, only a quarter has been raised by taxation, whilst three-quarters have been borrowed at onerous rates of interest, to be a burden on the nation's future) brings things to a crisis. When peace comes, capital will be needed for all sorts of social enterprises, and the resources of Government will necessarily have to be vastly greater than they were before the war. Meanwhile innumerable new private fortunes are being heaped up by those who take advantage of the nation's need; and the one-tenth of the population which owns nine-tenths of the riches of the United Kingdom, far from being made poorer, will find itself, in the aggregate, as a result of the war, drawing in rent and interest and dividends a larger nominal income than ever before. Such a position demands a revolution in national finance. How are we to discharge a public debt that may well reach the almost incredible figure of 7,000 million pounds sterling, and at the same time raise an annual revenue which, for local as well as central government, must probably reach 1,000 millions a year? It is over this burden of taxation that the various political parties will be found to be most sharply divided.

The Labour Party stands for such a system of taxation as will yield all the necessary revenue to the Government without encroaching on the Prescribed National Minimum Standard of Life of any family whatsoever; without hampering production or discouraging any useful personal effort, and with the nearest possible approximation to equality of sacrifice. We definitely repudiate all proposals for a Protective Tariff, in whatever specious guise they may be cloaked, as a device for burdening the consumer with unnecessarily enhanced prices, to the profit of the capitalist employer or landed proprietor, who avowedly expects his profits or rent to be increased thereby. We shall strenuously oppose any taxation, of whatever kind, which would increase the price of food or of any other necessary of life. We hold that indirect taxation on commodities, whether by Customs or Excise, should be strictly limited to luxuries; and concentrated principally on those of which it is socially desirable

that the consumption should be actually discouraged. We are at one with the manufacturer, the farmer and the trader in objecting to taxes interfering with production or commerce, or hampering transport and communications. In all these matters—once more in contrast with the other political parties, and by no means in the interests of the wage-earners alone—the Labour Party demands that the very definite teachings of economic science should no longer be disregarded.

For the raising of the greater part of the revenue now required the Labour Party looks to the direct taxation of the incomes above the necessary cost of family maintenance; and for the requisite effort to pay off the National Debt, to the direct taxation of private fortunes both during life and at death. The Income Tax and Super-tax ought at once to be thoroughly reformed in assessment and collection, in abatements and allowances, and in graduation and differentiation, so as to levy the required total sum in such a way as to make the real sacrifice of all the taxpayers as nearly as possible equal. This would involve assessment by families instead of by individual persons, so that the burden is alleviated in proportion to the number of persons to be maintained. It would involve the raising of the present unduly low minimum income assessable to the tax, and the lightening of the present unfair burden on the great mass of professional and small trading classes by a new scale of graduation, rising from a penny in the pound on the smallest assessable income up to sixteen or even nineteen shillings in the pound on the highest income of the millionaires. It would involve bringing into assessment the numerous windfalls of profit that now escape, and a further differentiation between essentially different kinds of income. The Excess Profits Tax might well be retained in an appropriate form; while so long as Mining Royalties exist the Mineral Rights Duty ought to be increased. The steadily rising unearned Increment of urban and mineral land ought, by an appropriate direct Taxation of Land Values, to be wholly brought into the Public Exchequer. At the same time, for the service and redemption of the National Debt, the Death Duties ought to be regraduated, much more strictly collected, and greatly increased. In this matter we need, in fact, completely to reverse our point of view, and to rearrange the whole taxation of inheritance from the standpoint of asking what is the maximum amount that any rich man should be permitted at death to divert, by his will, from the National Exchequer, which should normally be the heir to all private riches in excess of a quite moderate amount by way of family provision. But all this will not suffice. It will be imperative at the earliest possible moment to free the nation from at any rate the greater part of its new load of interest-bearing debts for loans which ought to have been levied as taxation; and the Labour Party stands for a special Capital Levy to pay off, if not the whole, a very substantial part of the entire National Debt—a Capital Levy chargable like the Death Duties on all property, but (in order to secure approximate equality of sacrifice) with exemption of the smallest savings, and for the rest

at rates very steeply graduated, so as to take only a small contribution from the little people and a very much larger percentage from the millionaires.

Over this issue of how the financial burden of the war is to be borne, and how the necessary revenue is to be raised, the greatest political battles will be fought. In this matter the Labour Party claims the support of four-fifths of the whole nation, for the interests of the clerk, the teacher, the doctor, the minister of religion, the average retail shopkeeper and trader, and all the mass of those living on small incomes are identical with those of the artisan. The landlords, the financial magnates, the possessors of great fortunes will not, as a class, willingly forego the relative immunity that they have hitherto enjoyed. The present unfair subjection of the Co-operative Society to an Excess Profits Tax on the "profits" which it has never made—specially dangerous as "the thin end of the wedge" of penal taxation of this laudable form of Democratic enterprise—will not be abandoned without a struggle. Every possible effort will be made to juggle with the taxes, so as to place upon the shoulders of the mass of labouring folk and upon the struggling households of the professional men and small traders (as was done after every previous war)—whether by Customs or Excise Duties, by industrial monopolies, by unnecessarily high rates of postage and railway fares, or by a thousand and one other ingenious devices—an unfair share of the national burden. Against these efforts the Labour Party will take the firmest stand.

THE SURPLUS FOR THE COMMON GOOD

In the disposal of the surplus above the Standard of Life society has hitherto gone as far wrong as in its neglect to secure the necessary basis of any genuine industrial efficiency or decent social order. We have allowed the riches of our mines, the rental value of the lands superior to the margin of cultivation, the extra profits of the fortunate capitalists, even the material outcome of scientific discoveries—which ought by now to have made this Britain of ours immune from class poverty or from any widespread destitution—to be absorbed by individual proprietors; and then devoted very largely to the senseless luxury of an idle rich class. Against this misappropriation of the wealth of the community, the Labour Party—speaking in the interests not of the wage-earners alone, but of every grade and section of producers by hand or by brain, not to mention also those of the generations that are to succeed us, and of the permanent welfare of the community—emphatically protests. One main Pillar of the House that the Labour Party intends to build is the future appropriation of the Surplus, not to the enlargement of any individual fortune, but to the Common Good. It is from this constantly arising Surplus (to be secured, on the one hand, by Nationalisation and Municipalisation and, on the other, by the steeply graduated Taxation of Private Income and Riches) that will have to be found the new capital which the community day by day

needs for the perpetual improvement and increase of its various enterprises, for which we shall decline to be dependent on the usury-exacting financiers. It is from the same source that has to be defrayed the public provision for the Sick and Infirm of all kinds (including that for Maternity and Infancy) which is still so scandalously insufficient; for the Aged and those prematurely incapacitated by accident or disease, now in many ways so imperfectly cared for; for the Education alike of children, of adolescents and of adults, in which the Labour Party demands a genuine equality of opportunity, overcoming all differences of material circumstances; and for the organisation of public improvements of all kinds, including the brightening of the lives of those now condemned to almost ceaseless toil, and a great development of the means of recreation. From the same source must come the greatly increased public provision that the Labour Party will insist on being made for scientific investigation and original research, in every branch of knowledge, not to say also for the promotion of music, literature and fine art, which have been under Capitalism so greatly neglected, and upon which, so the Labour party holds, any real development of civilisation fundamentally depends. Society, like the individual, does not live by bread alone—does not exist only for perpetual wealth production. It is in the proposal for this appropriation of every surplus for the Common Good—in the vision of its resolute use for the building up of the community as a whole instead of for the magnification of individual fortunes—that the Labour Party, as the Party of the Producers by hand or by brain, most distinctively marks itself off from the older political parties, standing, as these do essentially for the maintenance, unimpaired of the perpetual private mortgage upon the annual product of the nation that is involved in the individual ownership of land and capital.

THE STREET OF TO-MORROW

The House which the Labour Party intends to build, the four Pillars of which have now been described, does not stand alone in the world. Where will it be in the Street of To-morrow? If we repudiate, on the one hand, the Imperialism that seeks to dominate other races, or to impose our own will on other parts of the British Empire, so we disclaim equally any conception of a selfish and insular "non-interventionism" unregarding of our special obligations to our fellow-citizens overseas; of the corporate duties of one nation to another; of the moral claims upon us of the non-adult races, and of our own indebtedness to the world of which we are part. We look for an ever-increasing intercourse, a constantly developing exchange of commodities, a steadily growing mutual understanding, and a continually expanding friendly co-operation among all the peoples of the world. With regard to that great Commonwealth of all races, all colours, all religions and all degrees of civilisation, that we call the British Empire, the Labour Party stands for its maintenance and its progressive development on the lines of Local Au-

tonomy and "Home Rule All Round"; the fullest respect for the rights of each people, whatever its colour, to all the Democratic Self-Government of which it is capable, and to the proceeds of its own toil upon the resources of its own territorial home; and the closest possible co-operation among all the various members of what has become essentially not an Empire in the old sense, but a Britannic Alliance. We desire to maintain the most intimate relations with the Labour Parties overseas. Like them, we have no sympathy with the projects of "Imperial Federation," in so far as these imply the subjection to a common Imperial Legislature wielding coercive power (including dangerous facilities for coercive Imperial taxation and for enforced military service), either of the existing Self-Governing Dominions, whose autonomy would be thereby invaded; or of the United Kingdom, whose freedom of Democratic Self-development would be thereby hampered; or of India and the Colonial Dependencies, which would thereby run the risk of being further exploited for the benefit of a "White Empire." We do not intend, by any such "Imperial Senate," either to bring the plutocracy of Canada and South Africa to the aid of the British aristocracy or to enable the landlords and financiers of the Mother Country to unite in controlling the growing Popular Democracies overseas. The absolute autonomy of each self-governing part of the Empire must be maintained intact. What we look for, besides a constant progress in Democratic Self-Government of every part of the Britannic Alliance, and especially in India, is a continuous participation of the Ministers of the Dominions of India, and eventually of other Dependencies (perhaps by means of their own Ministers specially resident in London for this purpose) in the most confidential deliberations of the Cabinet, so far as Foreign Policy and Imperial Affairs are concerned; and the annual assembly of an Imperial Council, representing all constituents of the Britannic Alliance and all parties in their Local Legislatures, which should discuss all matters of common interest, but only in order to make recommendations for the simultaneous consideration of the various autonomous local legislatures of what should increasingly take the constitutional form of an Alliance of Free Nations. And we carry the idea further. As regards our relations to Foreign Countries, we disavow and disclaim any desire or intention to dispossess or to impoverish any other State or Nation. We seek no increase of territory. We disclaim all idea of "economic war." We ourselves object to all Protective Customs Tariffs; but we hold that each nation must be left free to do what it thinks best for its own economic development, without thought of injuring others. We believe that nations are in no way damaged by each other's economic prosperity or commercial progress; but, on the contrary, that they are actually themselves mutually enriched thereby. We would therefore put an end to the old entanglements and mystifications of Secret Diplomacy and the formation of Leagues against Leagues. We stand for the immediate establishment, actually as a part of the Treaty of Peace with which the present war will end, of a Universal League or Society of Nations, a Supernational Au-

thority, with an International High Court to try all justiciable issues between nations; an International Legislature to enact such common laws as can be mutually agreed upon, and an International Council of Mediation to endeavour to settle without ultimate conflict even those disputes which are not justiciable. We would have all the nations of the world most solemnly undertake and promise to make a common cause against any one of them that broke away from this fundamental agreement. The world has suffered too much from war for the Labour Party to have any other policy than that of lasting Peace.

MORE LIGHT—BUT ALSO MORE WARMTH!

The Labour Party is far from assuming that it possesses a key to open all locks; or that any policy which it can formulate will solve all the problems that beset us. But we deem it important to ourselves as well as to those who may, on the one hand, wish to join the Party, or, on the other, to take up arms against it, to make quite clear and definite our aim and purpose. The Labour Party wants that aim and purpose, as set forth in the preceding pages, with all its might. It calls for more warmth in politics, for much less apathetic acquiescence in the miseries that exist, for none of the cynicism that saps the life of leisure. On the other hand, the Labour Party has no belief in any of the problems of the world being solved by Good Will alone. Good Will without knowledge is Warmth without Light. Especially in all the complexities of politics, in the still undeveloped Science of Society, the Labour Party stands for increased study, for the scientific investigation of each succeeding problem, for the deliberate organisation of research, and for a much more rapid dissemination among the whole people of all the science that exists. And it is perhaps specially the Labour Party that has the duty of placing this Advancement of science in the forefront of its political programme. What the Labour Party stands for in all fields of life is, essentially, Democratic Co-operation; and Co-operation involves a common purpose which can be agreed to; a common plan which can be explained and discussed, and such a measure of success in the adaptation of means to ends as will ensure a common satisfaction. An autocratic Sultan may govern without science if his whim is law. A Plutocratic Party may choose to ignore science, if it is heedless whether its pretended solutions of social problems that may win political triumphs ultimately succeed or fail. But no Labour Party can hope to maintain its position unless its proposals are, in fact, the outcome of the best Political Science of its time; or to fulfil its purpose unless that science is continually wresting new fields from human ignorance. Hence, although the purpose of the Labour Party must, by the law of its being, remain for all time unchanged, its Policy and its Programme will, we hope, undergo a perpetual development, as knowledge grows, and as new phases of the social problem present themselves, in a continually finer adjustment of our measures to our ends. If Law is the Mother of Freedom, Science, to the Labour Party, must be the Parent of Law.